The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Editor

HAROLD S. BENDER, TH. D. *Goshen College*

Associate Editors

ERNST CORRELL, Ph. D.
American University

CHRISTIAN NEFF, D. Theol.
Weierhof, Germany

BENJAMIN UNRUH, Lic. Theol.
Karlsruhe, Germany

GUY F. HERSHBERGER, Ph. D.
Goshen College

EDWARD YODER, Ph. D.
Goshen College

JOHN UMBLE, M. A.
Goshen College

VOLUME X OCTOBER 1936 NUMBER 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 186

THE PENNSYLVANIA QUAKER EXPERIMENT IN POLITICS, 1682-1756 187
Guy F. Hershberger

FRANCONIA MENNONITES AND MILITARY SERVICE, 1683-1923 222
John C. Wenger

ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES 1935-1936 246
Silas Hertzler

A Quarterly Journal

PUBLISHED BY GOSHEN COLLEGE

SANFORD CALVIN YODER, *President*

PUBLICATION OFFICE: SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: GOSHEN, INDIANA

The Price of the Mennonite Quarterly Review is One Dollar a year, prepaid in American Territory, in Canada, and Mexico. For all other countries add twenty-five cents postage. Single copies, thirty-five cents postpaid. Subscriptions should be sent to The Mennonite Quarterly Review, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, or Goshen, Indiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Printed in U. S. A.

EDITORIAL

The relation of church and state is an age-old problem that has faced all Christian groups in all ages. Various groups have found various solutions to the problem. One of the most courageous solutions attempted was that undertaken by the Quakers of colonial Pennsylvania in the Holy Experiment of William Penn. After slightly more than seventy years the experiment was abandoned. What makes the experiment particularly interesting to Mennonites and other serious-minded Christians who sincerely desire to apply the Gospel of Christ to the whole of life, is the fact that the Quakers who undertook this experiment were sincere and convinced Christian pacifists. That means that they were resolved to abandon the use of force if at all possible and to substitute for it Christian love. It is to their credit that they actually tried to apply the rule of love and Christian ethics in the affairs of a secular state and society. Professor Guy F. Hershberger has made a thorough study of the experiment with a view to determine why it failed, and what happened to the pacifism of its exponents. His complete study, originally begun as a doctoral dissertation at the State University of Iowa, will be published soon in book form. Meanwhile he offers a brief, and possibly inadequate, condensation of the results of his research in a summary article in this number of the Review. It is worth while mentioning in this connection that somewhat similar experiments have been carried on by Mennonites, particularly in the large autonomous Mennonite colonies in South Russia before 1917. There was this difference, to be sure, that the Quakers tried to govern Christians and non-Christians, pacifists and non-pacifists, together, whereas the Mennonites attempted only local government of their own people. It would be very much worth while to have a study of the Mennonite experiment in Russia (and more recently in the Paraguayan Chaco) of the same thoroughness and objectivity as the study of the Quaker experiment by Dr. Hershberger.

European Mennonites came to America two hundred years ago at least partly because of the prospect and promise of freedom from military service. For the most part those states (and the national government) which made commitment to the Mennonites and others on this point such as are found in the Pennsylvania and the national constitutions have kept faith with their non-resistant citizens. Nevertheless Mennonites have frequently been put to the test when America became involved in war, and the story of experiences of non-resistant Mennonites under test is both interesting and instructive for those interested in the maintenance of Biblical non-resistance in our current war-threatened world. John C. Wenger has gathered the story of the war experiences of the Mennonites of the easternmost counties of Pennsylvania, (Bucks and Montgomery counties and adjacent ones), who are united in what is called the Franconia Conference. The Review is glad to be able to present this chapter out of his forthcoming *History of the Franconia Mennonites,* which will be published next year.

Again this year the Review brings Professor Hertzler's excellent and exhaustive statistical report on attendance at Mennonite Schools and Colleges in North America. The report shows that attendance of Mennonite college students has remained almost stationary for several years and is still below the high mark of several years ago. Is the depression holding on in Mennonite farming communities longer than elsewhere or has the saturation point been reached?

VOLUME X NUMBER 4

The
Mennonite Quarterly Review

OCTOBER 1936

THE PENNSYLVANIA QUAKER EXPERIMENT IN POLITICS, 1682–1756

GUY F. HERSHBERGER

The Christian's task in this world is not an easy one. Jesus commanded His disciples to live the good life. Then He said they must do this in a world which contains a large amount of evil. To live the good life in an evil world is not easy.

There are many institutions in the world. Some are good; some are bad; others are indifferent. The Christian must make his contacts with all of them. But his relation to each must be such that his conduct will not be a violation of the good life. No secular institution of the world is of greater importance than the state. It touches the life of the individual on every side. For this reason it is important for the Christian to ask: What shall be my relation to the state? Every generation of Christians has asked this question. And the effort to arrive at a satisfactory solution has brought a variety of answers from the time of Christ to the present day.

In the New Testament we find Jesus recognizing the state as a lawful institution. He approves the payment of taxes and, indeed, pays them Himself. But His own outlook is entirely non-political. He declines to play the rôle of judge over men when He has the opportunity to do so. He rejects the offer of Satan to make Him the ruler of the earth. Christ's kingdom is not of this world.[1] Paul upholds the state as an institution providing justice and order. Chris-

[1] John 18:36.

tians are to respect it and live as good citizens.[2] But they are not to make use of the state authorities for the settlement of their difficulties.[3] The state is an institution of the world. The Christian lives apart from it.

The social teachings of the New Testament are based on the simple idea that man should love his neighbor as himself. The Sermon on the Mount gives a positive command to deal kindly with one's fellow men in the spirit of love. There is no occasion for the use of force as wielded by the state. In the early church political and economic values were depreciated. The emphasis was on purity of heart, the future life, and judgment. Individual Christians were held closely together within the bonds of Christian fellowship. But social problems beyond this fellowship belonged to the world. In case of distress help was extended, of course. But there was no program of social reform; no struggle against oppression; no political movement of any sort whatever. Early Christianity was a system of religion directed to the needs of the individual, and the body of Christians was definitely separated from the world and its institutions.[4] This was the situation during the first three centuries of the Christian era.

Then early in the fourth century the Roman Emperor Constantine accepted Christianity. By the year 380 A. D. Christianity was made a state religion. The church was now protected and supported by the state and in the course of time men were constrained by force to identify themselves with it. The church became a universal institution, made up of all kinds of persons, the great mass of whom were unable to meet the high standards of conduct taught in the New Testament. The result was an interpenetration of the church and the world. The standards of the pagan world met those of the church half way and the sharp distinction between church and state so evident in early Christianity no longer existed.

The New Testament demands could not be ignored entirely, however. So the church of the medieval age tried to solve the problem by a graded system of moral standards to which the Roman Catholic church still adheres. By this scheme the church accepts an inferior moral performance of the more worldly Christians at the lower grade in the scale. But the monastic orders of monks and nuns who stand at the top of the scale, in retirement from the world, and the ordained priesthood, supply this deficiency by living a right-

[2] Romans 13.

[3] I Corinthians 6:1-8.

[4] Cf. Ernst Troeltsch, *Social Teachings of the Christian Churches,* I, p. 82ff.

eous life vicariously for the general body of Christians who are unable to attain the highest moral standards.

Along side of the medieval church there were certain small, intimate groups of Christians who refused to accept this compromise with the social institutions of the world. They generally refused to use the law, to take the oath, to exercise dominion over others, or to participate in war. They emphasized religious equality, brotherly love, indifference to the state, appeal to the primitive church, and high moral standards for the entire group instead of only the few as in the case of the Roman church. This made for small groups, of course, but what they lost in the spirit of universalism they made up in intensity of life. This position was held, in a general way, by such historic groups as the Montanists, Donatists, Paulicians, Waldensians, and particularly the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century.[5]

With the rise of Protestant Christianity in the modern age there appear certain new and fresh attempts to solve the eternal problem of living the good life in an evil world. For this problem Lutheranism found the simplest solution. It is a solution rendered void of complications by creating a conveyance of two compartments between which the individual divides his time during his earthly pilgrimage to the promised land. One compartment labeled "the church" has an absolute monopoly of the Christian's religious faith, in the narrower sense. It also gives admonition for his life and conduct to which, as a Christian, he is expected to respond. But here there is no attempt at monopoly. For the Christian must devote some of his time to the other compartment of his conveyance, the state; and Lutheranism has seldom quarreled with the state on account of its demands on the life of the individual so long as there was no interference with religious faith in the narrower sense.

Luther accepted this solution to escape an embarrassing dilemma in his own experience. His deepest convictions were in line with those of the mystics who emphasized a rich inner religious experience. And he adhered to an unworldly standard of personal morality based on the New Testament ethic. He believed the Christian was commanded to love his fellow-man even to the extent of suffering wrong without retaliation. In this spiritual and ethical conception of religion Luther approached the sect type. And to the end, Luther held that the Christian, as an individual, must obey the command of love.

But there was another element in Luther's thinking in conflict with this strict ethical view. This was his conception of the church

[5] Not all of these qualities were necessarily found in all of the groups mentioned.

as a universal institution. He recognized that such a church would necessarily include some persons unable to attain the high ethical standard of the New Testament. Hence there must be some concession to the social order. Luther also found that his universal church was not secure without the protection of the state. The military force employed by the latter was not in accord with his views on personal morality, of course; but since the church could not exist without it, this concession was made also.

The practical effect of granting these concessions, while adhering to a strict personal ethic, was to encourage a double standard of morals. The individual becomes a dual personality dividing his services between the church and the state. As a Christian he obeys the commands of Christ; as a citizen of the state he does whatever it requires. Public morals and social control (except family life) are the concern of the state alone. Religion and faith are under the care of the church. So according to the Lutheran ethic the Christian, as a citizen, may do whatever the state requires short of renouncing his faith in Christ. There is a clear distinction between private and public morals.[6]

Under such an arrangement Lutheranism has little need for a political or social theory, and it has formulated none. It passively accepts the social order as of God and makes little attempt at its reconstruction. Luther gave little concern to questions dealing with the nature of the state or its source of authority, and present-day Lutheranism is not greatly concerned in directing the trend of public affairs. The state is really insignificant as an institution, requiring only obedience of the Christian. This helps to explain why the Lutherans were loyal to the colonies during the American Revolution. It also helps to explain why they did not furnish many active revolutionary leaders. They were inclined to accept as a matter of course the program of others. When the Reverend John P. G. Muhlenberg preached his farewell sermon before leaving for service in the revolutionary army he simplified the problem as follows: "In the language of Holy Writ, there is a time for all things. There is a time to preach and a time to fight; and now is the time to fight."[7]

Calvinism, on the other hand, presents a system of theology which is the source of tremendous social power. The doctrine of predestination involves a God of majesty who demands a strict holiness on the part of man. So from the beginning John Calvin and his

---

[6] Cf. Troeltsch, II, p. 523ff.

[7] W. W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America*, p. 264.

followers were driven into the work of the world charged with the responsibility of making it a holy society, ordered to the glory of God, under the control of the church. In its political aspect this meant a state church in which the righteous ruled the ungodly according to biblical principles. Inasmuch as the great objective was the glorification of God rather than the welfare of mankind, the moral emphasis was on those principles which derived from the Old Testament, however, rather than the New. Calvin's Geneva and Puritan New England are classic examples of this theocratic state-church system. Under such a system there was no room for the dual ethic of Lutheranism. Public and private morals were integrated into one organic whole and the system swept everything clean before it.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Calvinists modified their theology, but their vital influence in the social and political world did not weaken in the least. The change in doctrine, however, brought a corresponding shift in emphasis from the Old Testament and the glorification of God to the Sermon on the Mount and human welfare. Hence the Calvinist churches contribute to the solution of every social problem which presents itself, be it humanitarian rights, philanthropy, feminism, or social justice in any form. Now as in the past it is those churches which combine a genius for organization with a Calvinistic moral urge which accomplish most in social movements.

The third Protestant solution for the problem of Christian living in this world was offered by the Anabaptists. These people perpetuated the tradition of the medieval sects. Like Calvin, they believed in a holy society, dominated by the church under a rigid rule of biblical principles. But, unlike Calvin's regime at Geneva, their society was voluntary, completely separate from the world and the state. Its ethical principles were those of the New Testament. And they were directed to individuals within an intimate group of regenerate Christians. The Anabaptists considered the social order of the unregenerate world incapable of much good. Hence there was no interest in its reconstruction. They protested against it and withdrew from it. They created their own social order as a kind of oasis within the wilderness of sin.

With the government, especially, they had nothing to do. In the first place they did not need it, since its primary function was the punishment of evil-doers and their own society was righteous. In the second place, government employed the use of force, violating the New Testament ethic in which they believed. This does not mean

that the Anabaptists were anarchists as some writers suggest.[8] They believe strongly in the need of civil government for the world. But for the reasons given they believed it unlawful for the Christian to hold any civil or military office. Taxes were cheerfully paid, prayers offered for the magistrates, and the commands of the government gladly obeyed in so far as they did not conflict with biblical principles as they interpreted them. But to serve in the army or to participate in the operation of a government based on force was out of the question.

Sixteenth century Christianity offered four solutions for the social problem arising from an evil world. Anabaptism separated the church from the social order and erected an impassable barrier between the two. Lutheranism recognized a separation, but removed the barrier and permitted the individual to move freely across the line as necessity might require. Catholicism permitted an interpenetration of the church and society, but separated the product into classes with graded standards of moral achievement. Calvinism integrated the church and the state and then proposed to make the social order good by giving the controlling power to the righteous.

Each of these four schemes was designed for a particular moral view. The Calvinists removed the distinction between individual and public morality and emphasized an Old Testament ethic adapted to a vigorous corporate life. The Anabaptists believed public morality was necessarily on a low level, and emphasized a New Testament ethic of love adapted to individuals and small, intimate groups. The Lutherans and Catholics took an ethical position between these two extremes. The sixteenth century, therefore, seemed to show that a given moral view required a particular attitude toward the social order to meet its peculiar needs. And for those who adhered to the strict New Testament ethic of peace and love this seemed to mean a rather sharp detachment from the state and other institutions of the world.

But then, in the seventeenth century the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, challenged this idea by combining the ethical position of the Anabaptists with the Calvinist attitude toward the social order. These people have three lines of heritage, one of which is derived from the Anabaptists and tends to a separation from political relationships. So much did the idea of brotherly love and kindness appeal to them that at times they were on the verge of going over to the Anabaptist position which rejects the use of force even in the civil affairs of the state. But the Quakers also pos-

[8] Cf. J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 42.

sessed a rich political tradition common to the heritage of all Englishmen. And it was not so easy for an English yeoman, whose blood was charged with a political yeast from the days of King John and Magna Charta to that of Cromwell and the Commonwealth, to reject the state system, as it was for a pious peasant of Switzerland or Germany who had never enjoyed the taste of political privilege.

In addition, the Quakers inherited a strain of religious mysticism which taught that the spirit of every man is a veritable candle of the Lord. This doctrine of the "inner light" lent itself rather easily to a belief in the essential goodness of mankind. Hence the outside world seemed much better to the Quaker than it did to the Anabaptist. And the result was an optimistic hope for the imminent Christianization of the social order. For this reason the Quakers eventually identified themselves with the civil government, hoping to administer the affairs of state on the principles of love, brotherly kindness, and good will. They believed that under such a government all cruel, brutal, and inhumane methods of statecraft would disappear. Greed and selfishness would be eliminated; justice and humanity would prevail; and the result would be a warless society in which a peaceful Christian might act as a governor or magistrate with perfect ease of mind.

Here is the point where the Quakers and the Anabaptists differed. The latter rejected every kind of force. They were absolute nonresistants. The Quakers were nonresistant in their personal relations with their fellow men. And they rejected the military as unchristian and even unnecessary; for a Quaker state would be so governed as not to invite an invader. And, of course, there would be no aggression. But the Quakers regarded the use of force by the *civil* government different in principle from that of the military. Because of their faith in the goodness of man they hoped to reduce even this to a minimum. But the lawfulness of the police force in the hands of Christians who reject the military was seldom questioned. The Quakers, therefore, cannot be classed as absolute nonresistants.

This attempt to combine an uncompromising testimony of peace with an active political life was the distinctive feature of Quaker pacifism. They believed that the New Testament ethic of love which others had applied to individual relationships could be applied with equal success in the corporate life. William Penn gives his own views on government in the preface to his Frame of Government for Pennsylvania. He recognizes the need for a certain amount of coercion in civil affairs. But he gives it a place of minor importance among

the functions of the state and he hopes that in the course of time it can be reduced to a negligible minimum. He says: "They weakly err, that think there is no other use of government than correction, which is the coarsest part of it; daily experience tells us, that the care and regulation of many other affairs more soft and daily necessary, make up much the greatest part of government; and which must have followed the peopling of the world, had Adam never fell, and will continue among men under the highest attainments they may arrive at, by the coming of the second blessed Adam, the Lord from Heaven."[9]

This statement gives the key to Penn's political philosophy and his plan for the government of Pennsylvania. It was to be a government like that before the fall of Adam when man, God's deputy, ruled the world and "there was no need of coercive or compulsive means." It was to be a government for men of the highest moral attainments who would apply to the entire life of the corporate state those principles of love and kindness which governed their individual relations with their fellow men. This was the faith in which the "holy experiment" was launched and the seventy-five years which followed were to bring the answer to two important questions: Firstly, whether the Quakers would be able to maintain their ideas on military force against the opposition of an otherwise minded world. And secondly, whether they could endure the strain of political life without themselves losing some of that "high attainment", so necessary for a mild and coercionless government.

It is not difficult for the historian to answer these questions in the negative. The course of events as revealed in the documents makes it impossible to do otherwise. William Penn's was the forward look, however, and from that vantage point he firmly believed in the affirmative reply. He was well informed concerning the previous failures of Christendom, and fully aware of the evils which surrounded the Quaker society on every hand. But he doubted not the success of his own enterprise. For it was the undertaking of the true church, in whom dwelt the power of God.

Penn was fully aware that non-Quakers generally did not share his views on the oath and the military. Yet, they were invited into his province, even permitted to share in the work of the government. And this non-military, non-swearing government, manned as only true Quakers could man it, was not to infringe upon the religious beliefs of the others. The province would be governed by Quakers

---

[9] From the preface of the Frame of Government, reprinted in the *Colonial Records*, I, p. 30.

in accordance with their own principles, but the church and the state would not be identified. Caesar has no authority over conscience, said Penn, and the power of the church does not extend beyond excommunication. "There can be no reason to persecute any man in this world about anything that belongs to the next." "To call for fire from heaven was no part of Christ's religion, though the reproved zeal of some of His disciples. His sword is spiritual, like His kingdom."[10] This was a plea for tolerance and for freedom of conscience in the most advanced form then known, so it is not surprising that its author entertained genuine fear of a religion which takes "worldly power" into its hands.

What we do marvel at is Penn's optimistic belief that he and his coreligionists could carry out the program outlined above without employing the methods, or submitting to the spirit, of ordinary worldly politics; that his church and his state could be so closely intertwined and yet remain separate; and that his government could refrain from infringing upon the religious beliefs of others while operating on principles opposed to them. But only a study of the documents can show the breadth of the hiatus between the founder's hopes and the actual performance of his government.

The documents show that while the Quaker government was unable to maintain its anti-military principles and at times even those against the oath, yet to the extent that it did succeed in these it was accused by the opposition of using the government to force Quaker principles upon an unwilling non-Quaker population. And they also show that in their great effort to maintain their principles the Quakers in government developed a spirit of controversy and of "worldly politics" which weakened the spiritual foundation upon which the holy experiment itself was laid.

William Penn may have seen the possibility of such an outcome. But if he did his faith vanquished all fears. He was a daring spirit, not easily daunted by the magnitude of a task. If he condemned religion for using worldly power to propagate its own interests; if he believed that the church had been generally degraded by this very means; if he believed that the corrupt and selfish features associated with worldly government were forbidden by the Christian religion; if he believed all this, he also believed it possible for a body of true Christians to bring their moral principles into public life and maintain them unimpaired.

The strength to perform this task would not be of human origin, to be sure, but a spiritual power given of God. George Fox

---

10 S. M. Janney, *Life of William Penn*, pp. 108-109.

had explained the secret when he said: "I told them I lived in the virtue of that life and power, that took away the occasion of all wars."[11] It was with a consciousness of this power in his life that William Penn moved with seemingly perfect freedom in the courts of the great and mighty princes.

Penn always stood in favor with the royal house of Stuart. Janney, the Quaker biographer, cites this as "a memorable instance of the homage that vice pays to virtue." That is, the serene character of Penn stood out in such striking contrast to the general debauchery of court life that Charles II had to respect him. The profligacy of the court was personally repugnant to Penn and his frequent presence there is justifiable only because it was "with a view to promote the highest interests of his country," and "to render effectual relief to thousands who were suffering under the iron rod of persecution."[12]

This kind of activity was extraordinary for a Quaker even though they had always had a keen sense of mission to all the world. And in the nineteenth century Janney was still of the opinion that Penn had set a dangerous precedent even though personally able to weather the storms of such a career. The average person in such a situation, says Janney, "incurs the risk of gradually losing his hold upon better things" and eventually making shipwreck of his faith.[13]

The wisdom of Penn's political activity, such as campaigning for the election of Algernon Sidney to Parliament, is also questioned by the biographer: "It cannot be denied that the political arena, both in England and America, is a most unfavorable field for the growth of religious principles. Men of all parties who mingle in the strife generally attendant on elections are too much in the habit of using means, to promote the success of their candidates, which are not consistent with Christian principles. And, moreover, the very excitement which prevails at such times is unfavorable to that quiet contemplative spirit which peculiarly becomes the station of those who minister about holy things."[14] When Janney penned these words he was able to review the entire period of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania, and the sobering effect of this experience must have had an important influence in the formation of his opinion.

But Penn was a man of affairs, not only a contemplative mystic, and his role had to be enacted on a large and universal scale. He had political interests as well as religious and these were as broad

[11] George Fox, *Journal* (Norman Penny edition), I, pp. 11-12.
[12] Janney, pp. 157-159.
[13] *Ibid*, pp. 158-159.
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 158-159.

as the world itself. In 1693 he proposed a plan for a European parliament with power to settle international disputes. The parliament would have powers of coercion and in case any prince should fail to regard its judgment the united sovereignties would compel his submission by force. Thus would peace be maintained in Europe.[15] This plan takes rank with the best proposals in history for a federation of the world, and it provides the true measure for the breadth of Penn's political interest.

Here one cannot help asking how Penn could reconcile this international police with his ideal of non-violence. The Quaker distinction between military force and that of civil government seems artificial enough as it is. But if a combination of national armies under a league of nations for the restraint of a recalcitrant state is to be called a civil police force, the distinction between this and the military would seem a distinction without a difference. Possibly the best answer to our question is to say that Penn's intellectual insight was not nearly so profound or so deep as was his feeling for the cause which he loved. The idealist generally finds it easier to hitch his wagon to a star than to survey with care the path through which the wagon must travel. And in this William Penn was no exception. So long as the idea of a European parliament gave hopes for a better world, how could he be unduly concerned with the logic of his scheme?

The one place, however, where Penn's political ideals had an actual trial was Pennsylvania. This undertaking was more than the planting of just another colony. It was to be something new under the sun. Penn confesses having "been somewhat exercised, at times, about the nature and end of government, among men" and therefore says, "it is reasonable to expect, that I should endeavor to establish a just and righteous one, in *this province*: that others may take example by it . . . . For the nations want a precedent."[16]

It is regrettable that at the very beginning William Penn's experiment was hemmed in by restrictions which kept him from setting his own precedent in his own way. The charter granted him by the king of England gave lip service to Penn's noble intention of dealing kindly with the Indians. But it cautiously guarded against too much kindness by giving him power "to levy, muster and traine all sorts of men . . . and to make war and pursue the enemies and . . . put them to death by the law of war . . . and do all and every act which to the charge and office of a captain general of an

15 William Penn, *The Peace of Europe.*

16 Quoted in Robert Proud, *History of Pennsylvania,* I, p. 169.

army belongeth . . . as fully and freely as any captain general of any army, hath ever had the same." These provisions were certainly repugnant to Penn's ideals. But the British authorities forced them upon him. Thus in laying the very foundation of this holy experiment the militaristic world was taking so prominent a part that its success was jeopardized from the beginning.

It was also unfortunate for Penn's plans that circumstances required him to live most of his days in England. Altogether he was able to spend less than four years in Pennsylvania. The province was therefore governed almost continuously by deputies, and Penn's experiences with some of them illustrate the difficulty of maintaining a government such as he had planned. During the first four years the entire provincial council acted as a deputy governor with Thomas Lloyd, Quaker preacher and personal friend of Penn, presiding most of the time. But in 1688 Penn made a new departure, appointing Captain John Blackwell, a non-Quaker and a former British army officer, to the post of deputy governor.

This strange innovation must have shocked some of Penn's friends and followers. At any rate, we find him explaining the appointment in a letter to a friend on the ground that Friends refused to accept the position, "especially Thomas Lloyd to whom I offered it." Here follows an enumeration of Blackwell's qualifications, one of which is experience in commanding men. And then Penn makes a significant statement: "I thought I had a treasure in him, and being not a Friend, could better deal with those that were not and stop their mouths, and be stiff with neighbors upon occasion. This was my motive to have him, and so thou mayst tell others."[17] Evidently the exigencies of government in Pennsylvania demanded an executive able to mete out stiffer treatment than could consistently be given by a mild-mannered Quaker. There was greater need for this coarser function of government than Penn had anticipated.

Governor Blackwell remained in office only one year, however, after which Thomas Lloyd and his council resumed the executive tasks once more. But then in 1692 the Pennsylvania government was taken completely out of Quaker hands, due in part to its failure to support King William's War. It was two years before the British crown permitted the return of the province into Penn's hands and then not without demanding that he do everything within his power to "provide for the safety and security thereof."

Penn acquiesced, and agreed faithfully to refer to council and assembly all royal orders in behalf of defense. And according to

[17] Quoted in Janney, p. 356.

the report of the Lords he even said, "he doubts not but that they will at all times dutifully comply with and yield obedience thereunto." It was specified that Pennsylvania should provide a quota of eighty men upon application from New York. Then the government was transferred, Penn giving "good assurance" that the province would do its full duty along this line from time to time.[18]

Penn was in a hard situation. He was at the mercy of a militaristic world which completely surrounded him. He had founded Pennsylvania as a kingdom of God where the instruments of war should not be known. But now it was decreed that he must introduce these weapons and violate his principles or surrender his government to worldly princes and abandon the holy experiment. What should he do?

It was an extremely practical question; but apparently not difficult for Penn to answer. He would stay with his Pennsylvania, make what concessions he must, and hope for victory in the end. "Things are not just now . . . as you may reasonable desire," he wrote his friends in Pennsylvania. But this "you must not take amiss" for the "circumstances we are under" will not "permit another method at this time . . . . Accept this part of the goodness of God, and wait for the rest. We must creep where we cannot go, and it is as necessary for us, in the things of life, to be wise as to be innocent."[19]

In 1694 Penn was not an inflexible idealist. If he ever had been, he changed after he became the proprietor of Pennsylvania. The inevitable conflict between ethics and politics was having its effect on his life. His unwillingness to renounce political responsibility forced him, contrary to his will, to admit a distinction between the morals of the individual and those of the group. The holy experiment was founded on a belief that this distinction could be eradicated, but the proprietor found it could not be done for the present, at least.

The extent of Penn's compromise is really surprising. Some time after his government was returned to him he was accused of failure to provide the defenses promised. Penn then replied that the terms of the restoration did not require him to provide adequate defenses for Pennsylvania. He had merely promised to present the crown's request to the legislature. But if the latter failed to respond, that was something beyond his power. [20] The ears of the Pennsyl-

---

18 *New York Colonial Documents,* IV, pp. 108-110.

19 Quoted from Janney, pp. 396-397.

20 *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania,* II, Part 2, p. 197.

vania Quakers must have tingled when Penn made this shrewd defense before the Lords of Trade. But we may be sure he had no intention of reprimanding them for non-cooperation. During numerous controversies between governor and assembly there is no evidence that Penn ever attempted to reprove the Quakers for failure to provide military defense.

In thus loading blame on the assembly without hoping for a change in its ways, Penn can hardly be charged with dishonesty. And yet there was a certain lack of straightforwardness—a certain flirting with deception, which does not quite fit in with the ethical standard of a pious and spiritual Quaker. In private life Penn would have been willing to lift up the banner of peace at all cost. This is what a martyr must do. And Penn's generation of Quakers was of the stuff of martyrs. But martyrdom is more easily suffered in private life than in public. The "all cost" in private life may mean no more than the sacrifice of one's own life. But in public life it may mean the ruin and death of the enterprise to which one is attached.

Therefore, when the individual in public life begins to sacrifice his principles it may be with a personally unselfish motive. In this way it was that William Penn, out of unselfish devotion to his holy experiment, became willing to compromise his principles and started down the slippery path of dual morality. Penn's action on this occasion, taken at face value and judged by ordinary moral standards, was not a serious one. But criticism must be based not on the face value of the act, but on the direction which it took. And its direction was on the road which eventually leads to a renunciation of the ethical position of Quakerism, or a withdrawal from public life.

Now when one directs his attention to the internal politics of the holy experiment he finds even greater difficulties. Even without considering the military complications, the strain of political life itself was a major cause for the ethical undoing of the Quaker government. The practical demands of statecraft required methods out of harmony with the Quaker faith. Ethical standards insisted upon in private life were found unsuited to public morality. And the politicians in the assembly, much more than Penn, were compelled to renounce that "high attainment" upon which he relied for the making of his mild and coercionless state. This high attainment finds its basis in the Christian principle of love; it seeks the welfare of neighbor and brother; it manifests a spirit of unselfishness; it willingly suffers at the hand of an enemy rather than retaliate. In private life the Quakers were able to maintain this principle of love with

reasonable success. But in political life there was another principle running counter to it. This was the principle of political freedom. And herein lay a cause for their failure.

Ideals of social justice can seldom be fully achieved without the exercise of political power. Hence the pursuit of freedom involves a struggle for power which sacrifices the principle of love. This is well illustrated by the experience of the Quakers in Pennsylvania. They developed certain ideals of justice and liberty which they pursued relentlessly. Obstacles were removed by seizure of power and vigorous attack. This often led to acrid controversy, bitter feeling and a selfish spirit. The Christian principle of love was sacrificed to the search for political power. And when this was done the foundation of the holy experiment was gone.

No sooner was the Pennsylvania government launched than the struggle for power began. In 1684 William Penn returned to England to defend his proprietary interests and left the executive functions of the government to his council. The latter soon developed a spirit of independence and began to ignore Penn in its conduct of business. He resented this, complained that his name and that of the king were not so much as mentioned in acts of state, and declared it a dangerous practise, an unwarranted assumption of power.[21] This led to the appointment of Captain John Blackwell who assumed the office of Governor in December, 1688. The council then challenged Blackwell's authority on numerous points and the two engaged at once in a vigorous struggle for power, which brought the governor's administration to an inglorious end on January 1, 1690.

The trouble began when Thomas Lloyd absented himself from the council's meetings upon Blackwell's accession. Lloyd was a prominent Quaker minister and an Oxford graduate. Prior to Blackwell's appointment he was chairman of the council and, therefore, head of the government. He was also keeper of the broad seal of the province. The governor now demanded certain official papers and proprietary instructions of Lloyd and asked him to deposit the broad seal with the governor and council when absent from the province. Lloyd considered this a challenge to his power, an encroachment upon his official prerogative, and struck back in self defense charging "unkindly" treatment and demanding that the resolves be stricken from the records.[22]

---

21 Janney, p 286.

22 *Colonial Records*, pp. 230-232; 234; 236-237.

Many of the Quakers on the council now began a non-cooperation movement out of sympathy for their former chairman. So many remained absent from the meetings that the attendance was very slight. During the winter months there were never more than six or seven present, a bare quorum for minor business matters.[23] Then when the governor, with the approval of a minority of the council, ignored a provincial law for establishing courts by the governor and council and attempted to commission a judge by an earlier law which gave this authority to the governor alone, Lloyd asserted his power by refusing to attach the seal.[24] After the spring election in 1689 Thomas Lloyd was again chosen to the council and decided to take his place, but when he attempted to do so the governor refused to admit him and proposed to bring charges of high crimes and misdemeanors against him. This precipitated a near riot in the council and according to the minutes some of the discussions were "in such warm expressions as are not fit to be recorded."[25]

So far was this struggle for power carried that Blackwell's right to the governor's office was challenged and one of the members even declared William Penn without power to appoint a governor.[26] Blackwell then attempted to oust several members from the council. But they stood their ground and "many intemperate speeches and passages happened, fit to be had in oblivion."[27] The wrangling became decidedly puerile. For five weeks in April and May no meetings of the council were possible for want of a quorum, and when a quorum was finally secured the members used the time trying to convince the governor he had no authority to fix the place of meeting. This was a power which belonged to them and they would not allow the governor to take it from them.[28]

These doughty Quakers had definite ideals of justice and freedom. To realize these ideals they had to have political power and they were ready to pursue it to the end, even if they must do and say things not fit to be written into the minutes. This was no doubt necessary if they were to gain their purpose. But whether they realized it or not, they were striking at the very foundation of the holy experiment and if they continued too long they were bound to bring that noble enterprise to an end.

---

23 There were eighteen members on the Council. The frame of government provided that twelve members should constitute a quorum for business of major importance and six for matters of minor importance.

24 *Colonial Records*, I, pp. 231-232; 241-242; 247-250; 254-256.

25 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 263; 271-274.

26 *Ibid.*, I, p. 244.

27 *Ibid.*, I, p. 270-271.

28 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 277-283; 284ff; 293-4.

In the autumn of 1689 the governor brought before the council the question of military defense. He reported rumors of an impending French and Indian attack and proposed plans to meet it. The non-Quakers on the council agreed that citizens should be encouraged to prepare themselves with powder and ball. But the Quaker majority was not persuaded. It is important, however, to notice the variety of objections offered to Blackwell's proposal— in particular, the evasiveness of their character and the paradoxical manner in which the Quakers mixed the doctrine of peace with their struggle for power. The clear-cut testimony against war which characterized the early Friends was lacking. The debilitating effects of political life had already begun.

John Bristow considered the governor's usurpation of power a greater menace than an impending invasion and said that if the people are to raise an army for defense their duly elected representatives should at least be allowed to sit in the council.[29] John Simcock saw more danger from bears and wolves than from Indians and French. He could have no hand in authorizing a militia. Griffith Jones objected to the expense which would be involved and believed action should be deferred. Time might reveal it unnecessary. But he wished to be excused from giving definite advice on the matter, leaving it to the discretion of the governor, "who knows better than we how to answer the king's commands."

John Hill believed a militia would cause the Indians to grow suspicious and doubted whether there would be a satisfactory response to a call for training anyway. He advised against any compulsion of tender conscience, but believed the responsibility should be assumed by the governor. Samuel Carpenter, the prosperous Philadelphia merchant, in a straightforward manner expressed his personal opposition to preparedness measures, and a willingness to suffer rather than violate his conscience. Of course, he was "not against those who will put themselves into defense" but he hoped the Quakers would be "no farther pressed in this matter."[30]

The evidence is unmistakable that even at this early period some of the political Quakers were less positive in opposition to military measures than they were in defense of rights or in demands for power. The council did not grant the military measures asked by the governor, of course. But most of the Quaker members showed a definite tendency toward evasion and hedging when the question was brought straight before them. Their conscience still forbade mil-

---

29 *Colonial Records,* I, p. 300.

30 *Ibid.,* I, pp. 306ff.

itary action, but they preferred not to use the moral argument against it if another could conveniently be found. This is not what the early Quakers would have done. Nor was it approved by their own brethren as a standard of conduct in private life. It is clear that political life was developing a public morality among the Quakers out of line with their standard of personal morals.

William Penn understood what was happening and did what he could to prevent it. He removed Blackwell from office and restored the powers of governor to the council, warning it "to avoid factions and parties, whisperings and reportings, and . . . animosities."[31] The admonition went unheeded, however, and the fight continued when an attempt was made to restore John White to the office of clerk in New Castle county court, whence he had been removed by Blackwell.[32] Meanwhile, David Lloyd, clerk of the provincial court, was challenging the council's power to demand certain court documents for perusal. Whereupon Lloyd was discharged from office for high contempt until such time as he would make proper acknowledgment of his offense.[33]

One is compelled to feel that these Quakers carried their strife for power entirely too far. Like the *nouveau riche* they were intoxicated by their newly discovered strength and the inordinate assertion of power spread like a contagion, threatening the holy experiment with disaster, until Penn in anguish wrote the council: Your "division has torne me to pieces . . . . I am a man of sorrows and you augment my griefs, not because you don't concerne, but because you don't love one another . . . and if you cannot deny vourselves, your private humour and resentments, I must expect from vour strifes the loss, of the whole [province] to me and . . . you will find the change worse than you are able to imagine or mend . . . . Shall your dissatisfaction about David Lloyd and John White . . . ruin us all? Cannot you bear a little for the good of the whole at least till it please God to bring me among you . . . . I can forgive you in what any of you have thought or done at any time against me. Can you not for my sake and your own forgive one another? . . . . Strive not, read the fifth of Matthew, the twelfth of Romans . . . you will see what becomes Christianity even in government."[34]

Penn laid his finger at the heart of the issue. Could the ethic of Matthew five and Romans twelve be maintained "even in govern-

[31] *Colonial Records,* I, pp. 315ff.
[32] *Ibid.,* I, p. 329.
[33] *Ibid.,* I, p. 245ff.
[34] *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography,* XXXIII, pp. 423-425.

ment?" Could politicians actually love their enemies, and do good unto those who hate them and despitefully use them?[35] Could men actually rule a state without being "conformed to this world?"[36] Could the transformed, renewed mind actually remain in that state while governing the province of Pennsylvania? This was what the early Quakers believed. This was the faith on which Pennsylvania was founded. And this was the issue on which the holy experiment would stand or fall.

The Quaker politicians themselves could not help but see this issue. They made a bold attempt, however, to rationalize their actions. During the sixteen nineties the Society of Friends was disturbed by the famous Keithian controversy. George Keith, a Quaker minister, developed unsound doctrine and was finally disowned in 1692. He was given to vilification and in 1691, while under censure for his own religious views, criticized the civil authorities for arresting and convicting a pirate. He said this action was inconsistent with the Quaker doctrine of love.[37] Then he wrote an appeal to the yearly meeting attacking both the civil and the religious authorities in vigorous fashion. This appeal was printed by William Bradford, after which both Keith and Bradford were put in jail and fined by the Quaker government.[38]

Keith and his friends said this was religious persecution. But the magistrates explained it otherwise. They said some parts of Keith's pamphlet were directed against them as individuals and as members of the Quaker society. These they could overlook. But those parts which criticized their action as magistrates and officials of the government were seditious in their nature and subversive of civil authority. Such an offense must be punished. Hence the arrest of Keith and his abettors was not religious persecution, but punishment for sedition. The arrest was related only to those parts of Keith's broadside which criticized them as magistrates, and in no way to those parts having to do with differences in religion.[39]

This meant that the Quaker in public office could not tolerate criticism which might be endured by him as an individual. He could be loving and peaceful and longsuffering in private life, but not so in political life. The New Testament ethic on war and peace was practical for the individual Christian, but not for the civil magistrate.

---

35 Cf. Matthew 5:44.
36 Cf. Romans 12:2.
37 Proud, *History of Pennsylvania*, I, p. 371ff.
38 *Ibid.*, I, p. 371ff. Cf. also Nancy H. McCreary, "Pennsylvania Literature of the Colonial Period," *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, LII, p. 295.
39 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 374-376.

The Quaker in the meeting might love his enemies and do good to them that hate him, but not so the Quaker in the government. The religious Quaker might be transformed by the renewing of his mind, but the political Quaker must be conformed to this world. This was a direct denial of Penn's own belief and a positive violation of his advice to the council when he cited Matthew five as teaching what is becoming to Christianity "even in government." These magistrates were renouncing the original Quaker position on public and private morality, and retreating to the idea of a dual morality as the most convenient escape from their dilemma.

Numerous instances such as these cited above occurred from time to time until in 1701 the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting found it necessary to sound a note of warning. The minutes for that year contain a significant item entitled "Advice on Government." This minute, an epistle addressed to members of the meeting, recommends "peace and concord as the great fruits of charity without which we are nothing." Any that are otherwise cannot "be countenanced or suffered." "But so it is, to the grief of our hearts, and scandal of our profession, that some laying claim to the same, (in divers provinces within the verge of this meeting) have been too factious and troublesome in the government under which they ought peaceably to live; and have by their seditious words, insinuations, and practices, disquieted the minds of others to the making of parties and disturbances; and some under the fair colours of law, and privileges, have promoted their sinister ends; when indeed it was but to take vengeance against those whom they had taken disgust against: and this we cannot but declare our just abhorrence of; that any should sacrifice the peace of the province to private revenge; warning all to be aware of such: and wherever they find them, forthwith to deal with them, and to acquit our holy profession of them in a gospel way."[40]

This warning from the yearly meeting was needed, but was not very well observed. In 1706 the assembly and the governor engaged in a terrific quarrel over a bill for the establishment of courts. The issue was one of power. The governor desired the power to remove judges, to appropriate fines, and to license all public houses; the assembly wanted this power for itself.[41] For some time the discussion was directed to fundamental issues. But personal animosities were soon stirred up to such an extent that the debate degenerated into a puerile bickering over personalities.

---

[40] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,* I, p. 86.
[41] *Colonial Records,* II, pp. 262ff; 292-3.

At one joint conference of council and assembly the principal question for debate was whether the speaker of the house should stand or sit while addressing the conference. Lloyd had spoken several times while seated, when Governor Evans instructed him to stand. In case an enemy had smitten Lloyd on the cheek, the Quaker doctrine would have taught him to turn the other cheek also. But when a political rival instructed him to stand it was an affront on his parliamentary prerogative, so he bluntly informed the governor it was in his power to end the conference whenever he saw fit. Therefore, since he had suffered a personal affront it would end at once, upon which "the whole house rising departed abruptly," with Lloyd leading the procession.[42]

The Quaker philosophy includes the principle of meekness, forbearance and submission. And in private life the Pennsylvanians met the test satisfactorily. But once they tasted the power of public office, the honors associated with their position took precedence over principles with subservient connotations. And no one, not even the representative of proprietor or crown, might make a request which seemed to suggest superiority over the assembly without that body feeling it had suffered an affront—that its precious rights and privileges had been sacrilegiously trampled upon. So completely did political life cause the baser, vindictive spirit of self-assertion to overcome the spirit of love within these Quakers that a mere question of standing or sitting in conference was allowed to delay the establishment of a judicial system for the province. Surely twenty-four years of political life had gone far to impair the peaceable spirit of the Quakers and with it the foundation of the holy experiment itself.

More difficulties followed, including an attempt on the part of the assembly to impeach James Logan, William Penn's secretary, who was charged with infringing on the rights of the people. Logan referred to these events as "a desperate blow upon the profession."[43] And the 1710 official epistle of the yearly meeting emphatically decried "some things of a hurtful tendency . . . whose reformation we greatly desire." Especially in "matters of temporal government" had some things taken place "which are not to the honour of our holy profession."[44]

The epistle of 1710 also dealt very plainly with litigation. "And as to Friends going to law one with another whilst both in unity with

---

42 *Colonial Records,* II, pp. 314-315.
43 *Penn-Logan Correspondence,* II, p. 230.
44 *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,* I, pp. 132-133.

the body . . . such things may not be admitted amongst us but . . . let such be testified against as unworthy of our communion."[45] This was the true Quaker attitude on the question. It was based on the principle that brotherly love should govern the relations of Quaker brethren. In case a difference occurred, it should be adjusted among themselves. It was considered a reflection on the Quaker religion to call in a worldly magistrate to settle a dispute among them, for the Quaker religion was admittedly on a much loftier moral plane than the administration of ordinary worldly justice.

This position is not hard to understand. More difficult to understand, however, is how the Quakers could hold the office of magistrate, while repudiating its use for the settlement of their own difficulties. For one to be busily engaged in dispensing worldly justice which it is unlawful for him to receive does not seem logical or consistent. But it is no more illogical, of course, than for a pacific people to be active in a political system which involves all kinds of military obligations.

Some of the leading Quakers saw this illogical character of their position and expressed themselves accordingly. In 1710 Isaac Norris, a prominent Quaker, had reached the conclusion that Quakers who desired to be active in politics must choose among three alternatives: First, to "be independent and entirely by ourselves;" second, "if mixed, partial to our own opinion, and not allow the liberty to others;" third, to be "dissenters in our own country."[46]

And James Logan, William Penn's secretary, found to his dismay that the Quaker way of life would "not answer in English government."[47] So he says he had "been made a witness of the necessity of retiring from the world and withdrawing our hearts from all human dependencies." For this reason he urged Penn to dispose of his government as soon as possible. Friends should be relieved of the "intolerable hardships they lie under, in things their principles will not suffer them to be free in, as oaths and arms . . . [and] I can answer, for my own part, I am weary of government affairs as they must be managed."[48]

In 1715 an anonymous Quaker writer spoke with even greater certainty in a pamphlet entitled *Tribute to Caesar*. This author was a logical soul who argued that Christians "have no more to do in Caesar's court than in his camp." He says the Quakers decline the camp and defend the court when fundamentally there is no differ-

---

[45] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, I, pp. 133-134.
[46] *Penn-Logan Correspondence*, II, pp. 429-431.
[47] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 227-228.
[48] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 229-235.

ence between the two. To pay ordinary taxes is justifiable, of course, and it is not always necessary to inquire what the government does with them. But when taxes are levied specifically for war purposes, and announced as such, the Christian must refuse to pay them, says the author. Hence the expedient of voting money "for the Queen's use" in response to a demand for military aid is a sacrifice of principle.

He says as long as Quakers "weave church and state together, in one piece" as they do in Pennsylvania such inconsistency must follow, for the governments of this world are under the rule of the evil one. Despite his good intentions, says the writer, William Penn's government was ordained by Charles II, and judging by appearances Charles II was ordained of the devil. Therefore it is time for Quakers to heed the words of Christ who says His kingdom is not of this world, and separate themselves from all affairs of state. "I look upon this piece of politics in our church . . . to be an innovation, and as great an abuse to our profession, as any that ever yet was introduced into the church from the apostles to Constantine's time."[49]

Up to 1710 the course of William Penn's holy experiment was not very satisfactory. His hope that the Christian principle of love could be applied in political life as well as in private life had not been realized. But a number of factors helped to improve the situation from this point on for a period of thirty years. In the first place, a period of European peace was now on hand, relieving the military pressure from the outside. Secondly, the principal powers contended for by the assembly had been obtained. And thirdly, there was a more fortunate choice of governors from now on, which helped to reduce the friction between assembly and executive. As a result, the Quaker government of Pennsylvania entered a period of quiet complacency, awaiting its final test in the period beginning with 1739.

In October of that year, Governor Thomas announced the Anglo-Spanish war and asked the assembly to put the province in a state of readiness at once.[50] It was a long time since the assembly had received such a request. So its first reaction was to say in true Quaker fashion that laws for military defense would infringe upon peaceful consciences.[51]

And when the governor insisted that religious principles would not protect the people from the enemy, the assembly came back with

49 Philalethes (pseudonym), *Tribute to Caesar,* Philadelphia, 1715.
50 *Colonial Records,* IV, p. 354.
51 *Ibid.,* IV, pp. 367-368.

a firm declaration of faith in "an Almighty Power which superintends the government of the world." Emphatically they stated their belief that "principles of religion agreeable to His will and purity of heart, even as the world is at present circumstanced, may hope for His protection, who can turn the hearts of men as He pleases, and who, for the sake of ten righteous persons, would have spared even the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah."[52]

At this point the assembly met the religious issue squarely and answered the opposition in words one would expect to hear repeatedly from a people professing the peaceful doctrines of the New Testament. Had they taken this position consistently their case would have been strong. But the governor advanced other arguments in favor of military defense which they could not answer so effectively. He told them they did not depend on religious principles to protect them in civil affairs. They served on the jury and they sat on the bench to condemn "such little rogues to death as break into your houses." And they acted "in other offices where force must necessarily be used for the preservation of the public peace."[53]

The Quaker distinction between civil and military force had always been more or less superficial and the assembly's reply to this "little rogue" argument was weak. The best it could do was to say the burglar is worthy of death because he knows he is doing wrong while the soldier fights at the command of a sovereign and thinks he is doing his duty.[54] This argument makes it right to kill a wicked person, but wrong to kill a good one; and the use of the sword becomes, not a fundamental question of right and wrong, but a relative question of proper and improper use.

So far as one can see, the assembly's argument set aside the New Testament command to love one's enemy and to do good to those who hate and despitefully use one. And with it their trust in God for protection was likewise annulled. For if God "can turn the hearts of men as He pleases," and if He "for the sake of ten righteous persons would have spared even the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah," why would it not be as easy to trust in Him for deliverance from the burglar as from the foreign soldier?

Having destroyed the religious foundation of their position, the best arguments remaining against military aid were material ones. The assembly now argued that the expense would be too great and that Pennsylvania was blessed with natural protection, making

---

[52] *Colonial Records*, IV, p. 373.
[53] *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 369-370.
[54] *Ibid.*, IV, p. 373.

artificial defenses unnecessary. New Jersey separated the province from the ocean; New York and New England separated it from the French settlements in Canada; and Maryland, Virginia, Carolina and Georgia formed a protection against the Spanish settlements in the south. The French might be ambitious but they were too much separated by other English colonies to make them dangerous to Pennsylvania.[55]

When the issue was revived the following summer the assembly advanced the religious argument again, but immediately began working on a bill to raise money for the "king's use!" They could not complete it, however, until after harvest, they said. Anyway, it was rumored the war might soon end, "which if it proves true may occasion some alteration in the bill."[56] That is, in order to avoid pressure on a point of conscience the assembly was willing to compromise its position, but proposed to procrastinate as long as possible, hoping the compromise might not be necessary, after all.

At this point the assembly found a new issue enabling it to postpone the settlement of the military question still longer. The king's recruiting officers had enlisted some indentured servants who would use this opportunity to escape the remaining service due their masters. This was a real grievance, the assembly said, striking at the rights, the liberties, and the property of the Pennsylvanians.[57] A bill was finally passed raising 3,000 pounds for the "king's use" with a proviso that no warrant should be issued until all servants had been returned to their masters and assurance given that none would be enlisted in the future.[58] The military officials objected vigorously to this proposal, however, and the governor refused to grant it.[59] So the attempt to obtain a military law in 1740 was a complete fiasco although the failure turned on a question of economics and civil rights rather than one of religion.[60]

The revival of the military issue after a dormancy of almost thirty years produced several documents which revealed a changing Quaker attitude on the relation of church and state. One of these was by James Logan. In his younger days Logan had quietly told

---

55 *Colonial Records,* IV, pp. 372-373.
56 *Ibid.,* IV, pp. 422-426.
57 *Ibid.,* IV, p. 435; *Votes of the Assembly,* III, p. 378.
58 *Ibid.,* IV, p. 459; *Votes of the Assembly,* III, p. 409.
59 *Ibid.,* IV, pp. 466-467.
60 As additional punishment the Assembly even refused to vote the governor the money for the current year's support. *Votes of the Assembly,* III, p. 423. James Logan says the Assembly abridged the governor of a year and a half of his salary because of his stand on the enlistment of servants. *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.,* VI, pp. 410-411.

William Penn and other close associates the Quaker way of life was unfitted for political activity. But in September, 1741, he went much farther, addressing the yearly meeting then in session at Philadelphia and challenging the Quakers to abandon politics once and for all.[61]

Logan says that when he became William Penn's secretary in 1699 he recognized that all government was based on force and that someone must administer it. Therefore he accepted his post without scruples. Since that time he had tried to act consistently. He had always condemned aggressive war, but justified defensive war as identical in kind with the civil police force. On this issue he differed from the majority of Quakers. On his way to America he was surprised to learn that William Penn did not believe in armed defense for his ships. And when he found the Pennsylvania Quakers generally opposed to defensive warfare he disagreed so widely that he never became active in the meeting. He says, "I therefore, in a great measure declined that due attendance on their meetings of business, which I might otherwise have given."[62] He believed this course of action necessary in order to be consistent.

Then Logan challenged the meeting to be consistent also. He argued that if defensive warfare was wrong it was so because it employed the use of force. And since civil government is based on force it is the same in kind as defensive warfare. Therefore if those Quakers who differed with him on the latter question would be consistent they must separate themselves from the civil government. Legislation for establishing courts, he says, is no different from legislation for establishing a militia. "And from these premises it certainly follows, that whoever can find freedom in himself, to join in assembly in making laws, as particularly for holding courts, is so far concerned in self-defence; and makes himself essentially as obnoxious to censure as those who directly vote for it."[63]

Logan then reinforced his argument with an appeal to Penn's own experience. He said Penn came to the province invested with all the powers of a captain general. He may have hoped to manage the government without exercising these powers, but if so, his hope was vain. The need for military force was so persistently pressed upon him that he resolved to escape his embarrassment by appointing a deputy to perform the disagreeable duties of governor. "And I am witness," says Logan, "that in those two years, or somewhat less,

---

[61] The letter is printed in full in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, VI, pp. 403-411.
[62] *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, VI, p. 404.
[63] *Ibid.*, VI, p. 407.

that the proprietor took the administration on himself, when last here, he found himself so embarrassed between the indispensable duties of government on the one hand, and his profession on the other, that he was determined, if he had staid, to act by a deputy."[64] This is a damaging piece of testimony. For if the great proprietor himself found political life inconsistent with his religious profession, what more could he expect of those Pennsylvania Quakers who were made of lesser fiber?

Logan referred to the mixed character of Pennsylvania's population and declared it impossible to argue that anti-pacifists should stay out of the province. The Quakers themselves had invited them in. And now since they comprised two-thirds of the population their political views had to be recognized. The best thing the Quakers could do was to follow the example of English Friends—pay their taxes, live a peaceable life, and keep out of public office. If the war continued it was certain the advocates of defense would eventually have their way anyhow.

So in order to save further trouble the Quakers would better abdicate the government at once: "It is therefore proposed to the serious and most weighty consideration of this meeting . . . that all such who for conscience sake cannot join in any law for self-defense, should not only decline standing candidates at the ensuing election for representatives themselves, but also advise all others who are equally scrupulous, to do the same . . . and accordingly that the meeting recommend this to the deputies from the several monthly meetings or quarterly meetings in this province." He then added that many who supported Quaker candidates ostensibly for religious reasons really did so out of "an ill-judged parsimonious disposition." They were willing to keep the factions and animosities of the province alive "for no other reason than to save their money."[65]

Logan's argument was cogent enough. But the yearly meeting did not take it seriously at this time. Some of its more spiritual-minded leaders saw the seriousness of the situation, however, and began to lead the society away from politics. Soon after Logan sent his famous letter to the official meeting a saintly young Quaker in his early twenties wrote some lines in his journal, resolving "so to pass my time, as to things outward, that nothing might hinder me from the most steady attention to the voice of the True Shepherd."[66]

---

64 *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, VI, p. 407.
65 *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, VI, pp. 410-411.
66 John Woolman, *Journal and Essays of John Woolman* (Gummere edition), p. 164.

These were the words of John Woolman, a leader whose name is written large in the following period of Quaker history. They carry a note of spiritual power familiar enough in the early Quaker writings, but not so common in those of the eighteenth century. And they were a promise of greater things to come. For it was the genius of Woolman to bring a revival of spiritual strength, creating more concern for the inner life and less for the defense of rights or the exercise of power. His resolution against outward things was made with special reference to business affairs. But in the mind of Woolman it applied to politics as well. He was one of a group of vigorous young leaders who quietly, but resolutely, led the Quaker society out of the troublesome political arena into a new era of mystical quietism.

Some time was needed, of course, for this development to take place. After 1745, however, the yearly meeting constantly placed an increasing emphasis on the example of Christ "who hath commanded us to love our enemies, and to do good even to them that hate us." And Friends were urged "to be faithful to that ancient testimony against bearing of arms and fighting."[67] The epistle of 1746 was practically nonresistant in tone. All desire for worldly power was repudiated. High standards of moral attainment were demanded. It is evident that the Society of Friends was gaining new strength in its inner life, for which the leadership of Woolman was in part responsible.

But while the yearly meeting was coming back to the true antiwar position, the assembly moved farther away from it. The political Quakers had become so hardened to voting money for the "king's use," they no longer claimed to champion the principle of pacifism. And in 1748 they definitely told the council so.[68] Then later, when General Braddock came to drive the French out of western Pennsylvania, the assembly again began working on a bill to raise money for the "king's use," but soon reached a deadlock with the governor on the method of raising the money. When it was proposed to issue bills of credit they failed to agree on the length of time for sinking the bills. And when a general property tax was proposed the governor objected to the taxation of proprietary estates. In the end the attempt to raise the money did not succeed until the proprietors consented to a voluntary contribution.

The most impressive feature of this controversy is the complete absence of pacifism in the assembly's approach. The issue was politi-

---

[67] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,* I, pp. 452-453.
[68] *Colonial Records,* V, pp. 333-338.

cal and economic power. The assembly claimed no scruples against contributing military supplies. Instead, when military appropriations were delayed because of disagreement over the method of raising the money it complained of being rendered "odious . . . to the army that is come to protect us."[69] And the high point in anti-pacifist argument was reached when the assembly complained of inability to defend its own estates without protecting those of the proprietors gratis![70] This referred to the proprietors' insistence that their estates be exempt from taxation. Obviously the time had arrived when the Pennsylvania Friends must lose their "ancient testimony" for peace, or experience some kind of awakening to restore the pristine fervor of the faith.

The yearly meeting saw this point and struggled hard for a satisfactory solution. In 1755 it demanded conduct strictly in harmony with pacifist doctrine. The struggle for rights and privileges was completely repudiated. Friends were urged to submit to the authorities over them in so far as they could. And if anything was required contrary to conscience they were advised to suffer patiently, "not believing it to be allowed to the followers of Christ, by force and violence to oppose the ordinances of magistrates . . . ."[71] This note is entirely out of harmony with the actual performance of the political Quakers and approaches the nonresistant position more nearly than anything found in Pennsylvania Quakerism for a long time. The yearly meeting could no longer condone the conduct of the Friends in the assembly.

In line with this advice, when a new war tax bill was brought up for consideration shortly afterwards, a group of the more conscientious Quakers petitioned the assembly not to pass it.[72] And about the same time Samuel Fothergill, of England, a Quaker minister who ranks with John Woolman in his spiritual qualities, came to the province to assist the Friends in this trying hour. Like the prophets of Israel, Fothergill prayed and pleaded with his backsliding people until a few members in the assembly began to vote against military measures. Then in April, 1756, when the governor and council declared war against the Delawares and Shawanese, old Indian friends of the province, the breaking point was reached. Fothergill declared that the Quaker government was a salt which had lost its savour.[73] And early in June, six of the more conscientious Quaker assembly-

---

69 *Ibid.*, VI, pp. 423-424.
70 *Ibid.*, VI, p. 628.
71 *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting*, II, p. 76.
72 *Votes of the Assembly*, IV, p. 496.
73 *Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill*, pp. 255-256.

men resigned their seats, explaining that office holding was now equivalent to military service, "which from a conviction of judgment, after mature deliberation, we cannot comply with." So for the "peace of our mind, and the reputation of our religious profession," they asked to be excused from further service.[74]

The Pennsylvania assembly as a whole, despite its general departure from the Quaker principles of peace, had failed, nevertheless, to enact military measures with the speed which the British government desired. This was due largely, of course, to the protracted disputes over methods of raising the money. But whatever the cause for the delay, many British leaders believed it was time to put an end to these difficulties by forcing the Quakers out of the Pennsylvania government. This could be done it was thought, by enacting a law imposing an oath and a test for all office holders. And a bill to that end was actually introduced into the English parliament.

Influential Friends in England feared this might mean a complete political disablement of all Quakers within the realm. So they persuaded the leaders of Parliament to delay the proposed action while efforts would be made to effect a voluntary withdrawal of Friends from the Pennsylvania assembly. To this end the London yearly meeting urged the Pennsylvania Quakers not to stand for reelection and delegated John Hunt and Christopher Wilson to go to Pennsylvania and take up the matter with them personally.[75] These efforts received a good response and many Pennsylvania Quakers now refused to accept nomination. As a result, in 1756, seventeen new assemblymen were elected in a total of thirty-six. The average annual turnover had been about four,[76] so the significance of this election is obvious. Hunt and Wilson did not arrive in the province until after the election. But when they did come they induced four additional members to resign their seats at the opening of the October session, 1756.[77] The legislature normally had a few non-Quaker members. So in the new assembly the Quaker element was reduced to less than one-fourth the total membership.[78]

It is true, this withdrawal from the government was initiated to prevent the political disablement of the Quakers. Nevertheless, the ablest spiritual leaders believed this step necessary to preserve the spiritual life of Quakerism as well. Samuel Fothergill made a

---

[74] *Votes of the Assembly,* IV, pp. 564-565.
[75] *Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings for Pennsylvania,* pp. 37-40.
[76] See the roll of members in the minutes of the assembly at the opening of each session. *Votes of the Assembly.*
[77] *Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings,* pp. 41-42. *Votes of the Assembly,* IV, p. 626.
[78] *Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings,* pp. 41-42.

great contribution to the new departure. He understood the issues, and he analyzed the situation clearly. The Quakers had declined religiously, he said, because they tried to maintain a strict New Testament ethic while living an ordinary worldly life. The second and third generation of Pennsylvania Friends simply inherited their religion from their fathers as they had their estates. And while they cultivated the latter with diligence, the former was neglected until the garden of God became a "field uncultivated and a desert." They had bent their spirits to this world. And the older men in 1756 were not a generation of true Quakers. There were only a few "who have kept their garments clean, and whose hands are strong."[79] The old Quaker testimony was all but gone.

Fothergill found his only comfort in the younger generation, many of whom had turned their hearts to the work of the Lord. Some had entered the ministry, and others were in readiness for it, so "there is a prospect that the succeeding generation may excel the last."[80] Great movements are generally the work of young men. This was true of the founding of Quakerism, and it was true again in this day of revival within the society.

Among these younger men, first place goes to John Woolman, that truly Christian soul, the Saint Francis of America. The work of God in the life of George Fox was wrought anew in the soul of Woolman. When he reached his maturity men found him a prophet called to lead the Quakers back to their first estate. And because of their disappointing experience in politics it is not surprising to find him point to a non-political way of life.

As early as 1743 he spoke of being "weaned from the desire of outward greatness."[81] Again in 1755 he wrote the epistle for the yearly meeting, advising separation from the spirit of this world.[82] And then in 1758 he sat on a special committee recommending a declaration against all office holding which invited a violation of the Quaker conscience.

In line with this advice the yearly meeting passed a drastic minute demanding separation of all members from the provincial government, under pain of disownment. The minute says: "And if any professing with us should after the advice and loving admonitions of their brethren persist in a conduct so repugnant to that sincerity, uprightness and self-denial incumbent on us, it is the sense and judgment of this meeting that such persons should not be allowed to sit

79 *Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill,* pp. 231-233.
80 *Ibid.,* pp. 231-232.
81 Woolman, *Journal,* p. 164.
82 *Ibid.,* pp. 177-179.

in our meetings for discipline nor be employed in the affairs of truth until they are brought to a sense and acknowledgment of their error."[83]

The year 1758 is a definite turning point in Quaker history. By this notable minute, the society, for the first time, forbade officeholding to its members. With many it was an act of expediency because of practical difficulties in time of war. But Woolman's own convictions lay deeper than this. In 1759 he found the cause for the distress of the time in an attitude of pride and selfishness which had grown in the province for several generations. There was a spirit of exaltation and a lust for power which endangered the life of the society. Many of the younger men saw the seriousness of this situation, he says. And convinced of failure to live in conformity with "the purity of that religion" they professed, strove toward new and better things.[84]

According to Woolman, political life made a definite contribution to the selfish spirit of which he spoke. In his *Journal* for 1759, he asks whether civil affairs, "narrowness, party interest, respect to outward dignities, names or distinctions among men, do not stain the beauty of those assemblies, and render the case doubtful in point of duty, whether a disciple of Christ ought to attend as a member united to the body or not."[85]

There is nothing legalistic in Woolman's position. He does not say that civil government, or even the use of force is forbidden to the Christian. But he does express an honest doubt as to the compatibility of Christian living with the doings of political assemblies. In political life he found a force gnawing at the vitals of Christian experience. So he turned his face to other interests, and with him the Society of Friends entered an era of quietism. There was now a renewed emphasis on inward religion, and the social message of Quakerism found expression in the gentler work of philanthropy and social reform.

From the famous declaration of 1758 through the days of the American Revolution, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting maintained a consistent testimony against the holding of civil office. In 1762 the monthly and quarterly meetings were urged to labor with all offenders and report results to the next meeting.[86] In 1763 this advice was

---

[83] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,* II, p. 120.
[84] *Ibid.,* II, pp. 149-152; Woolman, *Journal,* pp. 223-225.
[85] Woolman, *Journal,* p. 228. The Gummere edition says "Collours of men." The above rendering is taken from another edition.
[86] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,* II, p. 172.
[87] *Ibid.,* II, p. 183.

repeated.[87] The following year the meeting complained that these efforts had not been wholly successful, but insisted that they continue, because the spiritual welfare of the people depends on staying out of office.[88] In 1770 the yearly meeting urged Friends to abstain from all associations and measures proposed for the assertion or maintenance of civil rights and liberties. It advised against mixing with those not of the Quaker profession and recommended a seeking "after quietness and stillness of mind," following the example of the early Quaker ancestors.[89] And during the Revolution the meeting was consistently opposed to participation in the war, disowning four hundred members who disregarded this advice.

While the new era of quietism represents a return to the vital religion of early Quaker beginnings, it must be remembered the two periods are not the same. The early Quakers were optimistic believers in the imminent triumph of peace and right. In this faith Penn and his followers planted their province with joy and gladness. Assuming the duties of civil and political life with enthusiasm, they were assured of setting up an ideal Christian state which would be an example to all the nations. They truly believed their religion would bring a transformation of the social order.

But in the following years the Quakers were disillusioned. In 1758 they no longer hoped for the imminent transformation of the social order. Influenced by the Wesleyan movement and their own experience they had a more real sense of the wreck of fallen man. They had come to believe that political life magnifies this fallen state. Hence the new religious fervor was different from that of the early Quakers.

It was a mysticism of negative rather than positive bent. It was not a lethargic, inactive religion; but a type less "creaturely" in its method and more exclusive in its attitude than that of the early Quakers. It cultivated the idea of the "remnant" and of the "peculiar people." It was a type of mysticism known as quietism. Absolute silence in the Quaker meeting became increasingly common. Emptiness of self was stressed. Creaturely activity was frowned upon; the outside world was regarded with askance; worldly affairs were renounced. "The contrast between 'The creature' and the Spirit became almost absolute, the dualism of human and divine nature almost complete."[90]

This is not denying a social interest in the later eighteenth century Quakerism. In fact, these years saw the rise of a new social

[88] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 200; 204-205.
[89] *Ibid.*, II, p. 271.
[90] Rufus M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, I, ch. 3.

movement of great power. And it was the pious Woolman who attended at its birth while supervising the obsequies which marked the end of the political experiment. Woolman had a burning passion for human betterment. But this new social spirit moved within well defined limits. It aimed to relieve suffering and arouse a conscience against slavery—not to change the social order by political methods. It produced no essays on political theory. Its leaders "knew little of economics and their sociology was mainly an affair of the heart."[91] It was a movement, alive and virile, but it held aloof from those activities inviting a compromise of the Quaker ethic.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Pennsylvania government, as a government, was one of the most successful in colonial America. This is particularly true of its Indian policy, especially in the earlier years. But the special problem of this study is not to evaluate the government, as such. It is rather to determine the outcome of that unique experiment which proposed to maintain a strict New Testament ethic on war and peace in the management of a political state. The Quakers had challenged the moral and social views of their time. They dared to combine the ethical position of the Anabaptists with the Calvinist attitude toward the social order. They carried into public life principles hitherto accepted by none save individuals and small, intimate groups detached from the world. They challenged the distinction between private and public morals by lifting the latter to the level of the former. This was the heart of the holy experiment. And this was where it failed.

The ethics of the Pennsylvania government proved no different in kind from that of the other colonies. The degree of moral performance may have been higher in some cases. But the lofty aim of William Penn was never realized. The practical demands of statecraft required methods out of line with the true Quaker ethic, so that the standards of love and kindness insisted upon in private life were not maintained in government.

The distinction between civil and military force always embarrassed the Pennsylvania government. The non-Quaker critics directed their shafts at this vulnerable point, and some of the more pious Quakers had their consciences pricked until they believed it best to remain detached from civil government. The more worldly Quakers who wanted to be consistent condoned defensive war and frankly advised those who disagreed with them on this point to withdraw from the government and be consistent also.

Some Quakers finally conceded that an ethic is after all not a

---

[91] Jones, *Later Periods,* I, ch. 10.

pacific ethic unless it rejects *all* force. Others who believed the distinction between the two kinds of force valid, nevertheless found it necessary to withdraw from politics because of the pressure of outside forces. And still others agreed with Woolman that the methods of worldly politics had an undesirable effect on the religious experience of the individual. For these various reasons the majority of Friends withdrew from politics in the eighteenth century. They found it incompatible with Quaker morals. So they sacrificed politics to save their ethic; while a few abandoned their ethical position to maintain a place in the government.

Whether this abandonment of government by a peaceful people who insist on maintaining their ethical principles is inevitable under all circumstances is not within the scope of this paper. This simply shows what happened in Pennsylvania. But even if this result is inevitable under all circumstances there still remains the ethical problem of choosing between the course of the worldly Logan and the pious Woolman. Shall the Christian abdicate the government in favor of unchristian men in order to save his religion? Or shall he compromise his faith in the hope of making some contribution to the social order? It must be remembered the political Quakers, with all their failures, made such a contribution.

What solution shall the Christian choose for the social problem arising from an evil world? Shall he return to the compromises of Luther and the medieval church? Shall he, like Calvin, choose an Old Testament ethic adapted to a vigorous corporate life? Is it worth trying the Quaker experiment again, hoping for greater success? Or, if one adheres to the New Testament ethic, must he remain detached from the political aspects of the social order? The Pennsylvania experiment would seem to indicate this to be the most logical procedure.

One more question must be raised. If the Christian makes the latter choice, does it necessarily follow that he makes no moral contribution to society—that his religion affects only heaven and his own inner life? Will not a glowing moral witness, even if organically detached from the political order, render a worthwhile service by sending out its rays of healing until they affect even society's ills?

FRANCONIA MENNONITES AND MILITARY SERVICE, 1683–1923

John C. Wenger

Some account of the attitudes and experiences of the Mennonites of Bucks and Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, in relation to military service and relief work in the past two hundred years of the history of the United States.

Apart from believers' baptism the most distinctive doctrine of the Mennonites is their biblical nonresistance. The principal founder of the Swiss Brethren church, Conrad Grebel, declared that Christians "use neither the worldly sword nor engage in war."[1] The Dutch Mennonite leader, Menno Simons, wrote, ". . . Christians are not allowed to fight."[2] This principle of nonresistance is not a philosophical pacifism—indeed there has been little effort made to justify rationally the position—but it is derived from a simple acceptance of the ethics of the New Testament.

The doctrine of nonresistance was and is fundamental in Mennonite thinking. It is included in all Mennonite confessions of Faith.[3] Briefly stated the doctrine means that a Christian may not participate in, or support, war or violence in any form whatever. This does not class Mennonites with anarchists, for they believe that the constituted governments are established by God and that it is their duty and privilege to be good citizens and to obey rulers in every point which does not do violence to the Christian conscience. Taxes are willingly paid.

During the two and a half centuries of Mennonite life in America several wars involving the American people have occurred. The principle of nonresistance was severely put to the test in these wars. When the leaders of the "Skippack" congregations in eastern Pennsylvania saw the coming of the French and Indian War (1754-1763) they arranged for the printing (1748-1749) of the large *Martyrs' Mirror,* the reading of which was calculated to arouse

---

1 Letter to Thomas Muenzer. An English translation of this letter was published in the *American Journal of Theology,* January, 1905. Quoted by John Horsch, *The Principles of Nonresistance as Held By The Mennonite Church,* Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, 1927, p. 14.

2 *The Complete Works of Menno Simons* . . . , Elkhart, Indiana, 1871; Part II, p. 434b.

3 See John Horsch, *The Principle of Nonresistance as Held By The Mennonite Church,* Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa., 1927.

conviction for the doctrine of nonresistance. And in the letter of 1745 which the leading spirits of the district wrote to the Mennonites of Amsterdam, Holland, they indicated that even prior to 1742 they had petitioned the Pennsylvania Assembly for military exemption,—but had not received it.

> "We likewise informed you that we have prayed and have made application to our assembly and the authorities in case of such an outbreak, to be exempt from the bearing of arms. Our request has been graciously received, with this answer, however, that it was not in their power to grant the request, and that the right of liberty of conscience must be sought from his Royal Highness, the King of Great Britain."[4]

Was it genuine discouragement, or was it part of an appealing cry for help that they wrote?:

> "We recognize the fact that we have made a mistake in coming to this far off country with insufficient assurance in the matter of freedom of conscience."[4]

It appears that the Franconia Mennonites were not pressed very hard to take up arms until the time of the Revolutionary War. Of course they did suffer somewhat from Indian attacks. But there is no evidence that Mennonites used self-defense in any attack made upon them;—and they probably fared about as well as their armed neighbors. "There was no compulsory military service in Pennsylvania prior to the Revolution."[5]

The nonresistant Mennonites have been quick to respond to the needs occasioned by war. For example, during the early part of the French and Indian War the Indians murdered and plundered in Northampton County. This was during the winter of 1755-1756. The Mennonite deacons Christian Meire (Meyer) and Valentine Hunsicker were entrusted with the Mennonite relief supplies which were delivered to the Moravians to be distributed. Valentine Hunsicker transmitted the following supplies: 34 bushels rye, 2½ bushels wheat, 1½ bushels Indian corn, 7 bushels dried apples, 736 pounds meal, 185 pounds meat and pork, 4 pounds butter, 21 pounds salt, 12 quarts beans, 6 yards flax linen, 7 yards tow linen, 4 ounces thread, 1 coat and waist coat, 4 pairs children's shoes, 1 child's jacket, 1 red sheet.[6]

On April 19, 1775 occurred the battles of Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, and the war for American independence was begun. At once the war spirit ran high. In Pennsylvania enthusiastic

---

[4] *Mennonite Year Book and Almanac*, 1910, pp. 25, 26.
[5] Wilbur J. Bender, *Nonresistance in Colonial Pennsylvania*, Scottdale, Pa., 1934, p. 13.
[6] *Mennonite Year Book and Almanac*, 1916, p. 18.

patriots organized companies of soldiers called "associations" to fight the British. These associations were purely of a voluntary nature and were not formed of men drafted by the Pennsylvania government, although the legislature did supply them with arms and ammunition. Mennonites, of course, would not take up arms and in some cases the militarists engaged in mob violence in their attempt to overcome dangerous indifference. During the summer of 1775 both the Pennsylvania Assembly and the Continental Congress declared themselves desirous of respecting the conscientious scruples of the nonresistants. On November 7, 1775 the Pennsylvania Mennonites and German Baptists (Dunkards) united in presenting a petition to the Assembly in which they pleaded their cause and stated their position. On the same day the Assembly ruled that all persons between fifteen and sixty-three (with a few exceptions) who were capable of bearing arms, should, in lieu of military service, pay an annual fine of two pounds and ten shillings. Much of the trouble between Bishop Christian Funk and his fellow ministers centered about the question of the payment of this war tax.[7] According to Funk most of the Franconia ministers opposed the payment of this special war tax to the Continental government. It is not known how many Mennonites voluntarily paid the fine, how many fines were forcibly collected, nor how many Mennonites were "overlooked" by friendly and lenient officials.

Not only did the Mennonites regard warfare as unchristian, they also refused to take an oath under any circumstances. This position they based directly on the words of Christ: "Swear not at all." (Mt. 5:34). In 1706 the Mennonites petitioned the Pennsylvania Provincial Assembly that "since they (with their predecessors for about one hundred fifty years past) could not for conscience sake take an oath, the same provision may be made for them by law as is made for those called Quakers in this Province and that the said law may be sent home with the rest passed by the late assembly in order to obtain the Queen's Royal approbation.[8] The Quaker government of Pennsylvania granted the Mennonites this liberty of conscience. And when in 1717 the Council began to require of all immigrants, an oath of allegiance to His Majesty and his Government, the Mennonites were admitted if they would but give "equivalent assurance in their own way and manner."[9]

---

[7] Bishop Christian Funk and his followers were expelled from the Franconia Conference in 1778 for having paid war taxes. The resulting small schismatic body is known as the "Funkites."

[8] C. Henry Smith, *The Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania* . . . , Norristown, Pa., 1929, p. 279.

[9] Colonial Records, III, 29, quoted in Smith *op. cit.*, p. 279.

There now appears to have been a long period during which the Mennonites were not troubled by the oath question. But on June 13, 1777 the Assembly passed an act requiring all male inhabitants over eighteen years of age to take an "Oath of Renunciation and Allegiance,"—renunciation of all loyalties to the old British government. Those who refused to take this oath were declared "incapable of serving on juries, sueing for debts, voting or holding office, buying or selling lands, . . . and possessing arms. Everyone traveling outside his own city or county without having taken the oath was to be clapped in jail till he took it. . . . The Revolutionary authorities, however, did not enforce the act very strictly and seem to have been particularly lenient to the peaceful sects."[10] On April 1 of the following year a second act declared that anyone not taking the Oath by June 1, in addition to previous penalties, could not serve as a guardian or executor nor make a will or testament. In addition such persons were required to pay double taxes and a fine of ten pounds and costs, or serve three months in jail. Finally exile from the state within thirty days, with confiscation of property, was threatened.

Most of the Mennonites were not prosecuted. But some were. In Chester County the fines of 1780, likely for refusing to take the Oath and for "non-associator privileges," included:[11]

	£.	S.	d.
Christian Holdeman	13	0	0
Matthias Pennypacker (a Mennonite bishop at Phoenixville)	55	5	1
John Buckwalter (succeeded Pennypacker as preacher at Phoenixville)	26	12	10
David Buckwalter	55	5	1

And from the members of the Saucon congregation in what is now Lehigh county a number of Mennonites suffered severely as the following petitions indicate.

TO the HONORABLE, the Supreme Executive Council of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

The petition of George Bachman, Jacob Yeoder, Casper Yeoder, Abraham Yeoder, Henry Sell, Peter Sell, Philip Geisinger,

---

10 Wilbur J. Bender, *Nonresistance in Colonial Pennsylvania*, p. 21.
11 C. Henry Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

Henry Geisinger, John Geisinger, Christian Young and John Newcomer, of Upper Saucon, in the County of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

Humbly Sheweth

That your petitioners having received Sentence of Banishment at the last Court of Quarter Sessions held at Easton, for no other cause but that we could not with freedom of conscience comply with the law of this State imposing a Test on the Inhabitants, and being deeply afflicted with the complicated distresses our unhappy families are thereby involved in; beg leave, in all humility, to lay before you our deplorable case, not destitute of some hope of obtaining your merciful Interposition, as we believe none can justly charge any of us with having ever done any act that can be construed inimical to the State or Government we live under, but have always been peaceable subjects ready and willing to contribute our full proportion towards the support of it except going into the military service, it being contrary to our religious principles to bear arms in any case whatsoever, and if we are found guilty of anything contrary to these our peaceful principles, may we suffer the severest penalties; and your petitioners believing the Supreme Council to be invested with a dispensing power to mitigate the severity of our sentence as we humbly conceive the process against us has not been according to the spirit of the law or the intention of the Legislature with regard to the peaceable industrious part of the people, which error is imputed to the magistrates not clearly understanding the full meaning of the first and third clause of the Act for the further security of the government, past the first of April last, and your petitioners not being able yet to get over their religious scruples about taking the said test, it appearing to us like joining our hands to the military service, and being very desirous to continue to be not only peaceable but useful subjects to this State, do humbly request the Honorable Supreme Council to take our distressed case into consideration, and grant such relief therein as to you in your wisdom shall seem meet.

And your petitioners shall as in duty pray, etc. 4 July, 1778.

"Accompanying this petition a number of the non-Mennonite neighbors of the above petitioners sent to the Council a memorandum testifying to the good character of the Mennonites, stating that they have always known them to be 'of unblemished reputation for uprightness and integrity in their conduct, conversation and dealings amongst men.' As to the Mennonite attitude toward war they say

that 'their present blindness to their own essential interest proceeds from an unhappy bias in their education, and not from a disaffection to the present Government.' These petitions evidently were of little avail, and the most drastic penalties passed the preceding April for non-compliance were applied to the letter as it would seem from the following petition the following September,—"

To the Honorable the Representatives of the Freemen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in General Assembly met:

The petition of Eve Yoder, wife of Jacob Yoder, of Upper Saucon township in the county of Northampton, in this State, yeoman, and Esther Bachman, wife of George Bachman, of Upper Saucon township, aforesaid Yeoman, as well as on behalf of themselves and their said husbands as also on behalf of John Geisinger, Abraham Geisinger, Henry Sell, Jasper Yoder, Abraham Yoder, Jacob Yoder, Henry Geisinger, Christian Young, John Newcomer and George Bachman, all of them freeholders and men of reputation of the said county who have always behaved peaceably and quietly and never intermeddled in State affairs, but paid their taxes and fines, furnished horses and teams for the continental service, whenever demanded, and some of them have gone with their teams as drivers to carry provisions to the army of the United States, for which service they have hitherto received no pay; that the said freeholders were summoned to appear at the Court of Quarter Sessions held at Easton in June last past, where they appeared accordingly and the test being tendered them by the said Court, which said test they conscientiously scrupled to take (being of the religious society called Menonists). Whereupon the said Court sentenced them to be banished out of the State within thirty days after the said Court and that all their personal estate be confiscated to the State, that afterwards all their said personal estate, even their beds, bedding, linen, Bibles and books, were taken from them and sold by the Sheriff to the amount of about forty thousand pounds. That from some of them all their provisions were taken and even not a morsel of bread left them for their children. That as all their iron stoves were taken from them, though fastened to the freehold, they are deprived of every means of keeping their children warm in the approaching winter, especially at nights, being obliged to lye on the floor without any beds; that some of the Men's wives were pregnant and near the time of deliverance, which makes their case the more distressing, and that by reason of the said proceedings ten of the respectful and considerable Familys in the said County of Northampton are becoming destitute and very much reduced.

May it therefore please this Honorable House to take the premises into consideration and to mitigate the Severity of the Sentence of the said Court and that some Regard be had to the command of God laid down in the Scriptures of Truth, to wit: 'What God hath joyned together let not man put asunder.' and that our husbands may be permitted to dwell with us, and that our children may not be taken from us. And your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

September the 9th, 1778.

her
Eve X Joder
mark
her
Esther X Bachman
mark

September 10, 1778
Read and ordered to be recommended to the Council.[12]

There is no record of the final disposition of this case. But there are about a dozen and a half graves at the Saucon burying-ground on which are G. A. R. markers of the Revolutionary War. Among these are Jacob Joder (1734-1807), Johannes Geissinger (1739-1811), Johannes New Kommer (1739- ?), Henrich Geisinger (1737-1817), Peter Sell (1757-1829), Philip Geissinger (1732-1809), and Abraham Geissinger, (1749-1825). Evidently the Council mitigated the severity of the original sentence.

After the War was over Mennonites were again granted the rights of citizens. The Constitution of 1790 specified that "those who conscientiously scruple to bear arms shall not be compelled to bear arms but shall pay an equivalent for personal service."[13] The immunities granted by this law are still guaranteed in Pennsylvania.

The War of 1812 was fought with volunteers, so the Mennonites were not tested. It has often been stated that the War of 1812 called forth another edition of the German *Martyrs' Mirror,* (Lancaster, Pa. 1814). It is not known whether the 1814 edition actually was published to strengthen the church on this doctrine because of general concern for its preservation. There may however have been no connection between the War and the publication of the book. The Mexican War (1846-8) did not involve the Mennonites.

---

[12] Smith, *op. cit.,* pp. 300-302.

[13] C. Henry Smith, *The Mennonites of America,* Goshen, Indiana, 1909, p. 372.

The next major war was the Civil War (1861-1865). In the early part of this conflict volunteers were plentiful and no conscription of men was necessary. As volunteers became less numerous a bounty of several hundred dollars was offered for each volunteer. This money was made up after the war by the levy of a "bounty tax." Elihu Clemmer of Franconia village, Montgomery County, recalls having paid a $25 bounty tax. But on March 3, 1863 an act was passed which provided for the enrollment of the national forces, one section of which provided for a draft, if it should prove necessary. Sometime during the progress of the war, probably about this time, Bishop Jacob Kulp of the Plain congregation, and Deacon Abraham M. Clemmer of the Franconia congregation, accompanied by Moritz Loeb, publisher of the Doylestown (Pa.) *Morgenstern* went to Harrisburg and interviewed Governor Andrew Gregg Curin. Thaddeus Stevens of Lancaster, a prominent member of the Lower House, also was energetic in promoting the interests of an important element in his constituency. And the Quakers always were active politically in securing military exemption. On February 24, 1864 a stricter conscription act was passed, but Section 17 favored the members of the nonresistant sects as follows:

"And be it further enacted that members of religious denominations who shall by oath or affirmation declare that they are conscientiously opposed to the bearing of arms and who are prohibited from doing so by the rules and articles of faith and practise of said religious denominations, shall when drafted into the military service be considered non-combatants, and shall be assigned *to* the Secretary of War to duty in hospitals or to the care of freedom, or shall pay the sum of $300 to such person as the Secretary of War shall designate, to be applied to the benefit of the sick and wounded soldiers: Provided, that no person shall be entitled to the benefit of the provisions of this section unless his declaration of conscientious scruples against bearing arms shall be supported by satisfactory evidence that his deportment has been uniformly consistent with such declaration."[14]

There were then two methods of escaping military service. Members of churches whose tenets opposed war were exempted upon the payment of the $300. A number (e.g., John N. Souder of the Franconia congregation, father of John D. Souder) paid this fine on two occasions. The other method was by hiring a substitute. Substitutes were hired not only by nonresistants but by others as well

14 *United States Statutes at Large*, Vol. 13, Chapter XIII, Sec. 17, quoted in Smith: *op. cit.*, p. 377.

for this was the common method of escaping military service for anyone desiring to remain at home. At first some substitutes could be hired for a few hundred dollars. But as substitutes became more scarce they were able to command immense sums. For example, Frank H. Moyer of the Salford congregation (his widow is Mrs. Sarah C. Landis of the Mennonite Home, Souderton), who was not yet a baptized member, paid $1,000 for a substitute.

One member of the Lexington congregation, Jacob S. Overholt, (father of John M. Overholt) felt that he would be responsible if his substitute were killed. (Evidently he also was certain the $300 would also simply be used to hire soldiers.) So when he was drafted he went to camp. He died in 1865 and his widow used to relate the following story to her children: One day as the none-too-vigorous Overholt was working, Abraham Lincoln walked through the camp. He stopped a moment with Overholt and asked his age. "Forty-six," replied Overholt. "Do you have a family?" asked Lincoln. "Eleven children." Lincoln reached in his pocket for a pencil and pad, wrote a note, and asked Overholt to report to his commanding officer. He did so; and was paid and discharged! Some months later he took sick. While on his death-bed his son John (aged seven, and who now in his eightieth year[15] told the story to the author) brought home the *Morgenstern* which contained the news of Lincoln's assassination. John says his father wept.

Evidently very few Mennonites accepted military service in the Civil War. The Franconia congregation had one soldier, Ephraim Delp. After the war he made a confession to the congregation and was reinstated. But a number of young men of Mennonite families, not yet baptized, accepted military service, and later, as Mennonites, were pensioned for their service.

The Saucon petitions of 1778 indicate that during the Revolutionary War some Mennonites were forced to aid in the war by serving as teamsters. Very likely many of these teamsters were young men who were not yet baptized. The Upper Milford Mennonite burying-ground has at least ten graves with G. A. R. markers of the Revolutionary War.

No pressure to service of this type seems to have been exerted upon the Mennonites during the Civil War. But some Mennonites did make heavy overcoats and similar garments for the soldiers at a dollar per garment. And after the war, when the government needed money and offered Government bonds of $530 each paying

[15] John M. Overholt died September 21, 1936.

five per cent interest in gold (which greatly exceeded the value of paper money) the Franconia Mennonites bought freely.

The Spanish-American War of 1898 was fought with volunteers and was the occasion of no trouble for the Mennonites.

However, when the United States entered the great World War on April 6, 1917, the doctrine of nonresistance was to be tested as it had not been tested for almost a century and a half. It should be mentioned at once that the Franconia Mennonites were at no time abused physically; they seem to have fared somewhat better than some of their brethren in the western part of the United States. Perhaps this was due to the fact that, being more numerous in the East, Mennonites are better understood there by their neighbors.

The United States government declared its policy in regard to the conscientious objectors in "section 1644 of the Selective Service Law of May 18, 1917, which, after exempting certain public officials, ministers and students of religion, and persons in the military and naval services, provides:

> And nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing and whose existing creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organization; but no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant.[16]

This after all certainly did not allow for full freedom of conscience, for it is conceivable that a given "conscientious objector" might have conscientious scruples against performing duties which the President had declared noncombatant. Nevertheless members of the nonresistant sects rejoiced that the exemption went even so far. On August 9, 1917 the bishops and secretary of the Franconia Mennonite Conference addressed a letter to President Woodrow Wilson thanking him for the consideration already shown the Mennonites, assuring him of a good attitude on their part, and pledging him their support in prayer; but pleading for a fuller freedom of conscience:

> Therefore we humbly petition your excellency that we may be exempted from participation in war **in any form** AND SINCERELY APPEAL TO YOU that in your message setting forth what shall constitute noncombatant service, that you give

[16] Walter Guest Kellogg, *The Conscientious Objector,* New York, 1919, pp. 16, 17.

due recognition to our religious convictions, that we may be permitted to serve God and humanity in such capacity only as will not violate our conscientious obedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

In due time splendid consideration was granted to the drafted Mennonites. It might be mentioned here that the May 3, 1917 meeting of the Franconia Conference had declared that

> All members working in ammunition factories are not considered as communicant members.

In June 5, 1917 all men between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one were required to register at their respective voting places.

A special session of the Franconia Conference met at the Souderton meetinghouse August 20, 1917. A number of young brethren had been drafted. It was the sense of the meeting that Mennonites could accept no service, either combatant or noncombatant, under the military arm of the government. At this special meeting a committee of three was appointed to work with the Lancaster Mennonite Conference, the Church of the Brethren, and the Brethren in Christ. This committee was composed of Bishop A. G. Clemmer, Preacher Joseph G. Ruth, and Deacon Wilson R. Moyer. They were instructed to go to Washington in behalf of the drafted brethren.

The committee of three, together with William A. Derstine and others, went to Washington.[17] Considerable fruitless energy was expended in seeking interviews with the proper officials. For example an effort was made to interview Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary to the President, but he informed them that the work they desired was not in his province. After some time William A. Derstine took Bishop Clemmer with him, paged Senator Penrose from the senate (which was then in session) and told him they desired an interview with Secretary of War Baker. Senator Penrose instructed his secretary, Leighton Taylor, to promptly arrange for the interview. A telegram was then sent to the Mennonite General Conference (which was then in session at the Yellow Creek Mennonite Church, near Goshen, Indiana) informing them of the coming interview with Mr. Baker. A return wire requested them to postpone the meeting a day or two as the General Conference Committee was also hastening to Washington.[18]

---

[17] Unfortunately no one recorded the movements of the Franconia brethren during the World War. There is a slight disagreement among the several brethren involved on matters of detail, such as the exact order of the several interviews.

[18] This committee was composed of Aaron Loucks, S. G. Shetler, and D. D. Miller.

Before the interview with Secretary Baker the Franconia Committee and William A. Derstine interviewed Provost Marshal General Crowder. General Crowder had a Bible on his desk and soon called their attention to the military preparedness and cooperation exhibited in the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (as recorded in the fourth chapter of Nehemiah). Senator Atlee Pomerene of Ohio was also visited in the company of two Old Order Amish Mennonites (Slabaugh and Weaver) from Ohio. The Amish brethren were personally acquainted with Mr. Pomerene, and he kindly called Secretary Baker on the telephone and assured him that the Mennonites planning to interview him were a "well-meaning people."

On Saturday morning September 1, 1917 the Franconia committee, the General Conference committee, and the Amish committee from Ohio, interviewed Secretary Baker. Mr. Baker received the committees very cordially and was very considerate in the terms he presented to them. The Franconia committee returned home at once and on Monday, September 3, another special meeting of Conference and interested laymen was held in the Souderton meetinghouse. A report of this meeting is here given as reported by the *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia) correspondent.

Souderton, Pa., September 3, 1917

> Mennonite young men called in the draft will respond on the dates fixed for their appearance at local board headquarters to entrain for mobilization camps. Moreover they will meekly travel to these camps with their fellows in the call. But when they arrive at the mobilization points they will decline to wear a soldier's uniform or perform, as combatants or as noncombatants, any service in any way related to warfare. For this they expect to be sent as prisoners into detention camps, where they are resolved to remain, humbly but firmly obedient to the highest tenets of their faith—"thou shalt not kill" and "return good for evil."
>
> This was the decision of the Franconia Conference of the Old Mennonites[19] held in the Souderton Church here today. When it was reached by a vote of the bishops, ministers, and deacons the nearly 1000 conferees[20] wept in their resignation to what they believe the will of the Lord, and then they exhorted their parting youth to "go with a childlike faith in one another and a childlike love for one another and for the world and to resist naught but temptation."

---

19 In the region of the Franconia Conference members of this conference are called "Old" Mennonites in distinction from members of the Eastern District of the General Conference Mennonites, commonly called "New" Mennonites.

20 The ordained men of the Franconia Conference numbered less than sixty; the greater part of those present were visiting laymen.

With a simplicity almost incredible unless it were seen, the believers in nonresistance commended the souls of their sons to God while they "are suffering the punishment meted out for their faith" and counseled them to remain silent in face of all persecutions, great or petty. They told them to abstain from all the pleasures of camp life, particularly (enjoining) them against such inconsistencies with their humility, as card playing, and the use of tobacco. They raised a fund to defray the obligations of such as "undergo the punishment," and crying like the children whose pure lives they seek to emulate joined with the lads in emotional praying for the peace of nations and the salvation of men.

The conference, today, embracing seventeen Mennonite churches in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, in which there are about 350 drafted men, was held in this Montgomery County village to permit the faithful to reach a conclusion concerning what should be the attitude of the young men following a report of a meeting with Secretary Baker last Saturday. . . .

Presiding over the conference were three Bishops of the church namely, Bishop H. B. Rosenberger, of Perkasie, Bishop Jonas Mininger, of Elroy, and Bishop Abram Klemmer, of Franconia, as well as Deacon W. R. Moyer of Sellersville, one of the members of the committee. . . . There were present nearly a hundred deacons and ministers, besides the laiety, and as they entered the church and took their seats near the pulpit, they kissed each other on the lips, following the custom that has prevailed among them for centuries.

The peaceful smiles which marked the greetings on all sides as the brethren flocked into the meeting house was faded, however when the meeting was called to order and Bishop Klemmer in the language of the Pennsylvania German Country, explained its grave purpose. They sang two hymns, one entitled "The Christian's Passport," and the other "Laban."

Then Bishop Klemmer and Deacon Moyer related in detail their communications with the General Conference, which met in Yellow Creek Church near Goshen, Ind., last week, and their visit to Secretary Baker, who however, did not see them until after General Crowder had told them that any of their young men who refused to go to mobilization camps would be imprisoned exactly as though they had deserted from the army. . . .

BELIEVE BAKER IN SYMPATHY

Their interview with Secretary Baker, they said, convinced them that he fully understood the depth of their aversion to warfare, and they reported they were confident he would do all in his power for them so "that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life." Although they obtained nothing in writing from him, they set down in writing immediately following their interview the substance of his advice, and it was this advice which formed the high point of the discussion today.

The advice of the Secretary of War as written by Bishop Klemmer is as follows: . . .

Rather than continue with the *Public Ledger* article I shall here copy a small broadside which was evidently printed at the instance of the Franconia Mennonites but which is almost identical to a word with the letters sent out by the General Conference Committee.[21] In place of "your brethren, Aaron Loucks, S. G. Shetler, D. D. Miller, General Conference Committee" at the end of the letter, there is simply substituted at the end of the document: "The above resolutions were adopted by Franconia Conference, September 3rd, 1917."

Washington, D. C.,
September 1, 1917.

In an interview with the Secretary of War Baker, who received us very kindly, we received the following information and instructions:

1. That none of our brethren need serve in any capacity which violated their creed and conscience.
2. When they are called, they should report at the place designated on their notice.
3. From the place designated on their notice, they should go with others, who are drafted and called, to the training camp.
4. Report to the army officers the church to which they belong, and their belief in its creed and principles.
5. This non-resistant position will place them in detention camps, where they will be properly fed and cared for.
6. In these camps they will not be uniformed nor drilled.
7. A list of services considered non-combatant will be offered, but they need not accept any in violation of their conscience.
8. Those who cannot accept any service, either combatant or non-combatant, will be assigned to some other service not under the military arm of the government, to be designated later by Secretary Baker and the President.
9. Our ministers will be allowed to visit the brethren at these camps and to keep in touch with them.
10. Our ministers will be privileged to give this information and advice to our brethren in private or in public meetings.

As a committee, appointed by General Conference, assembled at the Yellow Creek Church, near Goshen, Ind., August 29th, 1917, in consultation with a committee of brethren appointed by the Franconia Conference, and a committee of Old Order Amish brethren, we have unanimously agreed to advise the following:

1. Since the interview with the War Department, we advise our brethren to state their position on church creed and principles to the army officers at mobilization camps.
2. We again encourage our brethren not to accept any service, either combatant or non-combatant, under the military arm of the government in violation of their conscience and the creed or principles of the Church.

---

21 J. S. Hartzler, *Mennonites in the World War . . .*, Scottdale, Pa., 1921, pp. 67, 68.

> While our brethren will not be freed entirely, yet freed from serving under the military arm of the government, we should be very grateful for the consideration that the authorities have shown us.
>
> May our church everywhere continue to send prayers to the Throne of Grace in behalf of our young brethren in this trying hour and for those in authority so that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life.
>
> The above resolutions were adopted by Franconia Conference, September 3rd, 1917.

The Special Conference of the Church of the Brethren held at Goshen, Indiana, in 1917 appointed a committee of three to meet the special needs occasioned by the War. W. J. Swigart, a teacher in Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa., Isaac W. Taylor, Neffsville, Pa. (an uncle to Deacon Edgar H. Taylor of the Frazer Mennonite congregation) and H. C. Early, Penn Laird, Va., were the members of this "Central Service Committee of the Church of the Brethren." These men desired official confirmation of the above report of the interview of September 1, 1917. Through Congressman W. W. Greist of Lancaster (himself a member of the Society of Friends and who also was a personal friend of I. W. Taylor) an interview was secured for Swigart and Taylor with Secretary Baker. Mr. Baker confirmed all the ten points except the eighth. This was then restated as follows:

> Those who cannot accept any service, either combatant or non-combatant, will be held in detention camps to await such disposition of their case as the Government may decide upon.

Aaron Loucks of Scottdale sent the corrected report to Secretary Baker and under date of September 14, 1917 received a letter from Mr. F. D. Keppel, Third Assistant Secretary of War, stating that in the corrected form the report was entirely satisfactory to Mr. Baker.

The first five drafted brethren[22] from the Franconia Conference arrived at Camp Meade, Maryland, September 19, 1917. The uniform was forced on two of these Mennonite conscientious objectors the next day. Aaron Loucks reported this incident in a letter to Mr. Baker. On the same date as Aaron Loucks wrote to him, the Secretary of War issued an order[23] "to all Commanding Generals of the National Army and National Guard Divisions to the effect that

---

[22] Isaac O. Frederick, Marcus K. Lederach, Melvin L. Moyer, William Rice and John Ward.

[23] From a letter of the Adjutant General, Mr. L. A. Dewey, to Aaron Loucks, September 29, 1917.

selected Mennonites who report to camps for duty be not forced to wear the uniform . . . . Apparently there was only one Franconia Mennonite who experienced much difficulty in claiming his right to wear civilian clothes,—Levi M. Meyers at Camp Greenleaf, Ga.

The following list comprises the conscientious objectors of the Franconia Conference. After each man's name is given his congregation, and the camp to which he was sent.

1. Mahlon R. Alderfer—Rockhill—Camp Lee, Va.
2. Herbert E. Beck—Blooming Glen—Camp Meade, Md.
3. Reinhert B. Bishop—Lexington—Camp Meade, Md.
4. David D. Derstine—Franconia—Camp Meade, Md.
5. Norman A. Derstine—Souderton—Camp Meade, Md.
6. Isaac O. Frederick—Franconia—Camp Meade, Md.
7. David H. Gehman—Hereford—Camp Dix, N. J.
8. Howard M. Hunsberger—Blooming Glen—Camp Meade, Maryland.
9. Daniel S. Landes—Deep Run—Camp Meade, Md.
10. Marcus K. Lederach—Salford—Camp Meade, Md.
11. Melvin L. Moyer—Towamencin—Camp Meade, Md.
12. Levi M. Meyers—Deep Run—Camp Greenleaf, Ga.
13. Edward Rice—Deep Run—Camp Meade, Md.
14. William Rice—Deep Run—Camp Meade, Md.
15. Abraham M. Stover—Blooming Glen—Camp Green, N. C.
16. John Ward—Rockhill—Camp Meade, Md.

Four of the Franconia Mennonites who were drafted accepted service. Clayton D. Kaisinger of the Souderton congregation saw service abroad. After the War he united with the Reformed Church. Walter Lapp of the Lexington congregation also saw service abroad. He later united with the Lutheran Church. Philip Mack accepted noncombatant service at Camp Meade; was again received into the fellowship of the church after the War, but later united with the General Conference Mennonites. Howard D. Swartley of the Franconia congregation accepted hospital work, chiefly at Camp Jackson, S. C., and at Camp Wadsworth, S. C. After the War he united with the Lutheran Church. One member, Edgar O. Brunner of the Souderton congregation, enlisted soon after the declaration of war with Germany, was in the division of the United States army stationed along the Mexican border, and was discharged in May, 1919. Upon confession he was again received into the fellowship of the Church and today is a member of the Rockhill congregation.

A brief description of the Franconia Mennonite conscientious objectors and their camp experiences is in order. They were almost all unmarried. Only one had more than the education provided by the public schools. The greater part were farmers, though there were

also several machinists, a brickmaker, an automobile mechanic, a baker, a merchant, a factory-employee, etc. Their years of birth ranged from 1891 to 1896. They were called to the several Camps from September, 1917 to September, 1918. Twelve, it will be noted, were at Camp Meade. Usually they were transferred to the "C. O". Barracks very soon after arrival at Meade. Two of those at Meade were sent to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; and at least eight of the remaining ones were furloughed out on farms on July 16, 1918. In general, those at Meade, as well as Alderfer at Camp Lee and Stover at Camp Green were given splendid consideration; of course they were strongly urged to accept some form of service. Stover was transferred to Camp Wadsworth, S. C. after a few months and was there placed among other C. O.s. Gehman, at Camp Dix, N. J., was made to work rather strenuously to influence him to accept the uniform. (He did not accept it.) Meyers, who was sent to Camp Greenleaf, Ga., was compelled to carry a heavy load of crushed stone for hour after hour. Finally he submitted to the wearing of the uniform. Two weeks later Bishop A. G. Clemmer and Deacon W. R. Moyer went to Camp Greenleaf in his behalf and Meyers was permitted to again wear civilian clothes. The strength of conviction of the young brethren was tested in various ways, threats were made to intimidate them, etc.; but no one was kicked, beaten, or otherwise physically abused or tortured. In fact after some time ministers were permitted to hold services in the C. O. Barracks, and the brethren were quite at ease. Indeed Major Kellogg very wisely recommends that the C. O.s should hereafter be segregated in non-military camps "where not every other drafted man could see them lolling about and basking in the sun."[24] One cannot but expect the average soldier to resent what appeared to be mere cowardice and an unwillingness to fight for country.

Perhaps one is justified in turning aside a moment to examine the picture of a typical Mennonite as presented by Major Kellogg.[25] Of course he acknowledges that he based his impressions solely on his camp contacts, and on some Mennonite literature he read. On the whole the few historical errors he makes are easily overlooked. But those who know the Mennonites feel that the picture drawn by Major Kellogg presents a rather unworthy example of one of the minor branches of the denomination. Their unsocial character; their rural isolation; their wearing of beards, "hooks and eyes" in place of buttons, etc.; does not describe the Mennonite Church. It

---

[24] W. G. Kellogg, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
[25] W. G. Kellogg, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-42, 130.

is indeed true that Mennonites are chiefly an agricultural people, are generally settled in colonies, do maintain a certain degree of separation from the stream of American life, and so on. Many indeed do not vote; but this is due to a feeling that if they cannot support the government in military measures they should have no voice in the administration of the government. It may also be mentioned that experience during the World War deepened that conviction in the minds of many Mennonites. Before the Civil War, for instance, the majority of Mennonites voted. So far as the author knows there are scarcely a dozen Mennonites in the Franconia Conference who wear beards,—and they are old men. Not one of the bishops wears a beard, and their hair is not "unkempt." Separation from "the world" can be largely explained by the fact that Mennonite ancestors were for generations cruelly persecuted, even martyred, in Europe for believing in the baptism of adults, and the like. Whatever plainness of attire there is evident is not worn to "recall how European peasants dressed centuries ago," but is intended to be a visible symbol of the separation between the people of God and those who are not Christians (Romans 12:2, etc.). One cannot but wish that Major Kellogg had visited a Mennonite community before describing "The Mennonite." And the main body of the Mennonite Church was almost five times the size of the Old Order Amish Mennonite group in 1919; today the ratio is more than six to one. There were, in 1919, 36,980 members of the Mennonite Church. Some of the minor branches (who seem to be the ones described) are: Conservative Amish Mennonites, 1,254; Defenseless Mennonites 1,090; Old Order Mennonites 1,608; Old Order Amish Mennonites 7,746; Reformed Mennonites 1,764; etc. Major Kellogg's description may be true to some extent of some of the minor branches, but even then one feels he failed to understand them.

The work of the brethren Clemmer, Ruth and Moyer consisted chiefly of camp visitation, after the first interviews in Washington. The Committee was instrumental in securing better consideration in at least one case (Meyers), and was the means of encouraging the Mennonite C. O.s in the camps. When the young men were called to the camps this committee gave them typewritten sheets, "Helpful Hints to Our Young Brethren." The advice given was to take along a Bible, Sunday School Lesson Quarterly, Mennonite Confession of Faith, and a Church Membership certificate. The Committee urged the brethren to wear a "plain suit and hat;" to live a clean and exemplary life, to live close to God, to write home frequently and to meet together to study the Sunday School lessons if

possible. The Committee advised them against voting, since they cannot support the government in its military demands. The sheet is signed: "By order of the Church."

One of the most active men during the World War was William A. Derstine of the Rockhill congregation. Born September 10, 1888 he is of the sixth generation of Derstines in America (of pioneer Deacon Michael Derstine). When the United States entered the War he was in the automobile business in Quakertown. He at once became active in assisting the Franconia Committee. (In fact Conference later extended to him a vote of thanks.) When Bishops Loucks and Miller were not able to hold services at Camp Meade Derstine accompanied them (with Good and Habecker of the Lancaster Conference) to Washington where they interviewed General Crowder on October 23, 1917. The General called Secretary Baker on the telephone and arrangements were quickly made for Good and Habecker to hold services in the C. O. barracks the next day. Throughout the War Derstine was working in close contact with the General Conference Committee, and with Wilbur K. Thomas, Executive Secretary of the *American Friends Service Committee*.[26] He made many trips to Washington and New York, bearing the expenses himself, in behalf of the Mennonites and their cause. The January 11, 1919 Special Session of Conference appointed Derstine "to cooperate with the Lancaster and Western committees in reference to our interests in the bills now pending in congress calling for universal military training." He was released at the October, 1919 Conference.

At a joint meeting of the Executive Committee of the Mennonite Relief Commission with some members of the Eastern Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities and some members of the Lancaster and Franconia Conferences, held in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, January 4, 1919, a decision of great importance was reached. The group decided to accept the invitation of the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (later the Near East Relief) Committee to send a group of Mennonite relief workers to the Near East. William A. Derstine and Aaron Loucks were chosen as "special investigators and general directors for the opening of the work." A group of forty-two men (nine were Mennonites), with a cargo of several thousand tons of relief supplies, sailed from

---

[26] Mr. Thomas, with a group of about twenty young men who had been furloughed to the Friends' organization, visited the services at Rockhill one Sunday morning during the late summer of 1918.

New York on January 25, 1919. The Mennonite leaders (Derstine and Loucks) returned in May. No separate Mennonite unit was established; the Mennonites accepted work under the Near East Relief Committee.

The matter of furloughs for the religious C. O.s was taken up by Derstine, Loucks, Thomas, and others on a number of trips to Washington. Mr. F. P. Keppel, Third Assistant Secretary of War, had the administration of the objectors in his charge. Mr. R. C. McCrea of Columbia University was entrusted with the task of administering furloughs for the objectors. As was noted above, all but about two of the Franconia Mennonite objectors at Camp Meade were furloughed to farm service. The matter of examining the objectors as to their sincerity was in the hands of a National Board of Inquiry. The following three men were appointed to membership on the Board June 1, 1918: Major Richard C. Stoddard of the Judge Advocate General's Department, chairman; Professor Harlan F. Stone, Dean of the Columbia University Law School; and Judge Julian W. Mack of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. About two and a half months later Major Stoddard was assigned to duty overseas, and was succeeded as chairman and member by Judge Walter G. Kellogg of the Judge Advocate General's Department. This committee traveled all over the United States visiting the several army camps and examining C. O.s. The C. O.s were divided into a number of classes: those who were recommended for farm or industrial furlough, those recommended for non-combatant service, those (insincere) assigned to military duty, etc. Fifteen objectors from Camp Meade were transferred to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, July 11, 1918, for further examination. In this group were the brethren David D. Derstine and Marcus K. Lederach. There they were placed in C. O. Barracks, and given non-military tasks. Two weeks later (July 25) they (at least Derstine and Lederach) were transferred to Fort Riley, Kansas, and again placed in C. O. Barracks. Here they worked as laborers. On October 18, Derstine was furloughed to a farm in Kansas.

Mahlon R. Alderfer of Fort Lee, Va., was furloughed to State Hospital work at Williamsburg and Staunton (Va.) on October 12, 1918. David H. Gehman of Camp Dix, N. J., was scheduled for a farm furlough, but after the Armistice (Nov. 11) he was held in camp until discharged, December 13, 1918. Most of the Franconia Mennonite C. O.s were discharged in December, 1918 or January, 1919. Conference advised them to return their pay to the Government; and Conference pledged itself to pay the young brethren

for the time they spent "in witnessing for Christ." The Committee of three (Clemmer, Ruth, and Moyer) had charge of this matter. Most of the C. O.s returned their money as suggested. The committee raised $3,722.05 for the purpose but needed only $2,627.18 to pay the brethren involved.

Again it should be emphasized that the Franconia Mennonites were given very fine consideration by the Government. As early as May 2, 1918 Conference sent a letter of thanks to President Wilson "for the care and regard . . . shown our brethren." Under date of May 13, 1918 J. P. Tumulty, Secretary to the President, sent the following letter to J. C. Clemens, Secretary of Conference:

> The President asks me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 2d, and to thank you for your courtesy in writing him.

What should be the attitude of a non-resistant group toward buying "Liberty Bonds"? The official organ of the Mennonite church, the *Gospel Herald,* opposed such investments on the part of non-resistant Mennonites. The leaders of the Franconia Conference concurred. The May 2, 1918 Conference stated it had no objection to its members buying "Farm Loan Bonds,"—as suggested by Aaron Loucks although not many Franconia Mennonites purchased them. But all the while rather insistent efforts were being made to urge Mennonites to buy Liberty Bonds. A Special meeting of Conference was held at the Souderton meetinghouse July 25, 1918. The following resolution was adopted: "Be it resolved that we adopt the plan offered by W. L. Crooks to deposit into the local banks and for local purposes only such sums of money as may be arranged by the authority of the church and representatives of the Government." This plan was adopted to escape loaning money to the Government for war purposes. Yet it seems that the plan never was set in operation. What actually happened was that the Franconia Mennonites gave money in at least three ways: a small number bought Farm Bonds; a larger number bought Liberty Bonds when strongly urged; and finally a heavy drive for relief contributions was made. It is altogether probable that the great majority of Mennonites were opposed in principle to furthering the war by financial means. Yet when pressure came they probably placated their consciences with the thought that if the Government needs money it is the duty of a Christian to support his Government, and the responsibility for the expenditure of the money devolves upon the Government, not the Bond purchaser.

During this time drives for relief contributions were conducted among the Franconia Mennonites. By April, 1918, they raised $9,491.02. The May Conference of 1918 decided "that the collections for war sufferers' relief be continued." By April, 1919, $29,044.15 more was raised. A Special Session of Conference was held in the Souderton Meetinghouse January 11, 1919. "Relief and other problems arising because of the World War were considered." A Relief Committee consisting of A. G. Clemmer and W. R. Moyer was appointed to cooperate with the Lancaster and Western Committees in considering the needs of Armenia. The May Conference instructed the Relief Committee to attend the meeting at Kalona, Iowa in June, 1919 to "represent the interests of the Franconia Conference relative to relief work." The Mennonite church was handling relief funds at that time through a "Mennonite Relief Commission" which had been organized at the Forks Church near Middlebury, Indiana, December 26, 1917. The Commission supported the reconstruction work being carried on in France by the *American Friends Service Committee* of Philadelphia, and the Armenian relief contributions were given to the *American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief* of New York (Near East Relief). Throughout the Mennonite Church many Sewing Circles were organized and the garments made were forwarded to France through the American Friends Service Committee.

Another Special Session of Conference was held at the Souderton meetinghouse November 26, 1919. Conference decided "to help feed the under-nourished children in Central Europe." The work was carried on by the American Friends Service Committee in response to an appeal from Herbert Hoover, United States Food Commissioner. The money was sent by the treasurer of the Franconia Mission Board to the treasurer of the A. F. S. C., Mr. Charles F. Jenkins. By April, 1920, $5,982.34 was raised, in addition to War Relief contributions of $4,541.46. The total relief contributions of the Franconia Mennonites from 1917 to April, 1920 was $49,058.97. The relief committee consisted of A. G. Clemmer, Joseph G. Ruth, and W. R. Moyer. Relief work has been carried on until the present. Money was contributed to the Near East Relief, Mennonite relief work in Russia, Russian Mennonite emigrant fund, Mississippi flood sufferers, etc. In 1936 $2,425.52 was contributed to the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, flood sufferers. The Franconia Mennonites have given about a hundred thousand dollars to relief work since the Great War, and this is in addition to home and foreign mission contributions.

This account would not be complete without the tragic story of Clayton H. Kratz, who lost his life in relief work in Russia.[27] He was born November 5, 1896 in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, the son of William and Elizabeth Kratz. At the age of eight he moved with his parents to the village of Blooming Glen where he ultimately finished high school. After attending West Chester Normal School he taught school for several years. He then enrolled at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, on September 26, 1917.

As early as 1919 there was a conviction on the part of some Mennonites that relief work should be carried on in South Russia by the Mennonite church. In August a committee of three, A. J. Miller, Roy Allgyer and A. E. Hiebert, was sent to Russia to investigate and report. They reported that a very great need existed. The following June (1920) the Mennonites of South Russia sent a committee of four representatives to the United States to appeal for help. On July 27 the great relief organization of the several branches of the Mennonite Church, the Mennonite Central Committee, was organized at Elkhart, Indiana. During August, 1920, relief supplies and more funds were gathered. A group of four was to be sent, but only three had been chosen. In the course of a conversation by the Secretary of the Relief Committee with Harold S. Bender, now Dean of Goshen College, and in response to a request for a suggestion Bender recommended Clayton Kratz who would have been a senior in Goshen College that Fall and who had been elected president of the student religious organization, the Y. P. C. A. Kratz expressed willingness to accept the call of the church and postponed his school career for the time. He was approved. A relief unit, Orie O. Miller of Akron, Pennsylvania; Arthur Slagel of Flanagan, Illinois; and Clayton Kratz of Blooming Glen, Pennsylvania, was selected to go to Russia and to begin relief operations with twenty-five tons of clothing, bedding, etc., and a minimum budget of ten thousand dollars per month. They sailed from New York on the steamer *Providence* September 1, 1920, for Naples, Italy. After staying eight days in Italy they sailed for Constantinople, arriving September 21. Kratz and Miller sailed for Sebastopol, Crimea, on October 2. Soon after arrival they pressed on into the Russian interior, visiting the Mennonite settlements at Alexandrovsk and Halbstadt. Kratz remained at the latter place while Miller returned to Constantinople. Kratz at once began to formulate relief plans. This portion of Russia was then under General

[27] Material for this story was taken from P. C. Hiebert and Orie O. Miller: *Feeding the Hungry, Russia Famine, 1919-1925,* Scottdale, Pa., 1929, pp. 90-96; 165-170; 343-353.

Wrangel and his (anti-Bolshevik) White Army. But the Russian situation was so uncertain that the American Mennonites chose Constantinople as their distant base of supplies. Judging from the account of G. A. Peters, a Russian Mennonite and new friend of Kratz, the risk Kratz took by working in Halbstadt was grave; but Kratz was losing his life for his brethren's (and Christ's) sake. "That which we had for some time seen coming, but in which none of us wanted to believe, came. It came with a storm and a tempest that overthrew and destroyed everything. The army of General Wrangel was forced to retreat precipitously, first into Crimea, then into foreign parts. Then the Red Soviet banner waved over all government buildings from the cold ice-sea to the Sunny South coast. Destruction and death went mocking and vagrant through the land." The Russian Mennonites had urged Kratz to flee. Perhaps he had not fully understood his danger. But he had resolved to stay. And his Russian brethren admired him for it. The evening before the White Army withdrew Kratz had been persuaded to leave for Crimea. But he never was permitted to start. For the White Army withdrew; the Reds took charge; and immediately arrested Kratz. Through the efforts of Russian Mennonites he was soon released. Again he went about his work.

"At Goshen College he had always taken an active part in the religious activities of the school community, and now, awaiting with uncertainty the development of each day, he spent much time reading the Bible he had carried with him. His calm resignation deeply impressed the family with whom he stayed. He spoke of his mother, his family, and his dearest friends." One evening a messenger rushed to Peters announcing that Kratz had again been arrested. He had already been taken from Halbstadt. The next day a Russian Mennonite saw and spoke with him a few moments. Kratz "was entirely quiet and composed in spirit." He was last seen in Fuerstenwerder.

Peters made a fruitless effort to follow him. Alvin J. Miller later Director of American Mennonite Relief in Russia, later appealed to the Soviet Foreign Office at Kharkow. But Clayton Kratz was gone. No one knows his earthly resting place. He laid down his life for his friends. In the cemetery of the Blooming Glen Mennonite Church a stone has been erected in his memory with the simple inscription:

MEMORIAL
CLAYTON H. KRATZ
NOV. 5, 1896
WENT TO RUSSIA 1920

ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935–1936

Silas Hertzler

For the eighth consecutive time, attendance data for Mennonite schools and colleges in the United States and Canada, are herewith presented. These cover the attendance for the school year 1935-1936, including the summer of 1935. Table XII gives the data on degrees and diplomas for June 1935; and where degrees were granted at the end of the summer session for August 1935.

Three sources of information were used for these reports. Questionnaires were sent to all schools and colleges about which the writer could receive information. In a few cases it took several requests before the data were returned. Catalogues were available from seven of the larger institutions. Where necessary, and when available, additional facts were taken from this source to supplement the replies to the questionnaires. In addition Rev. A. A. Schroeter, of Reedley, California, statistician for the Mennonite Brethren Church of North America, sent the facts used for several schools of that group which did not reply. The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the assistance of all those who co-operated in any way in compiling these reports.

Of the institutions which had replied at various times in previous years twenty are included in this report. No data could be secured from The Sunnyside Bible School of Freeman, South Dakota. The data for Freeman Junior College are all taken from the annual catalogue issued in June 1936. In addition several academies never before included have been added, through the assistance of Rev. A. A. Schroeter and of the schools themselves. Attendance data are included in this year's report from the twenty-four institutions whose names and addresses follow.

Bethel College, Bethel College, Kansas.
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.
Eastern Mennonite School, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio.
Hesston College and Bible School, Hesston, Kansas.
Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas.
Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota.
Ontario Mennonite Bible School, Kitchener, Ontario.
Winkler Bible School, Winkler, Manitoba.

German English Academy, Rosthern, Saskatchewan.
Bethany Bible School, Hepburn, Saskatchewan.
Corn Bible School, Corn, Oklahoma.
Tabor Bible School, Dalmeny, Saskatchewan.
Oklahoma Bible Academy, Meno, Oklahoma.
Herbert Bible School, Herbert, Saskatchewan.
Frazer Bible School, Frazer, Montana.
Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Gretna, Manitoba.
Reedley Bible School, Reedley, California.
Zoar Academy and Bible School, Inman, Kansas.
Hillsboro Bible Academy, Hillsboro, Kansas.
Talitha Bible School, Yarrow, British Columbia.
Morgenstern Bible School, Coaldale, Alberta.
Enid Bible School, Enid, Oklahoma.
Bible Preparatory School, Mountain Lake, Minnesota.

Institutions included for the first time this year are Morgenstern Bible School, Talitha Bible School, Frazer Bible School, Herbert Bible School, and Bethany Bible School. These are all academies of the Mennonite Brethren Church. No data could be secured from the Fairview Bible School of Fairview, Oklahoma.

The same tables as in previous years are included in this report. A study of attendance trends is of vital interest and value to the student of education among the Mennonites. The total for 1935-36 is 576 larger than for the year 1934-35. This is due in part to the fact that Tabor College, which did not operate during the previous year, reopened with an attendance of 162 during 1935-36. A number of institutions also reported for the first time this year. These new reports, however, are from comparatively small schools, with attendance ranging from 30 to 72 and add a total of only 247. The remaining increase of 167 is due both to an enlarged attendance at the schools offering work of college grade, and in those offering high school work only. Six of the eight schools giving college work report increases. The greatest increase of any school is at the Ontario Bible School where 55 more attended than during the previous year.

Table I gives the details available concerning total attendance. It also indicates the number of students of college grade, as well as those of high school grade. The 470 Bible students are for the most part students who attended Bible schools for six weeks or twelve weeks only. Facts concerning extension students, correspondence students, music and art students or other irregular groups are given in the foot notes.

Attendance of students of college grade is reported in eight institutions. The total of 1,151 is larger than for the four preceding years, though it is still 83 short of the record attendance in 1930-31.

Bethel has the largest enrollment of students of college grade as has been the case continuously since 1933-34. Previous to that date Bluffton had had more college students except for the year 1928-29, when Bethel had reported the largest number.

Every one of the twenty-four institutions for which data are available has some sub-freshmen students. This number is not large at Bethel and at Bluffton. Table III gives these data arranged by classes as far as this information is available to the writer. A number of institutions did not give any classification by years, so the column "unclassified academy" is used to record these facts. The sum of the Academy and Bible students, a total of 1,697, indicates the number of students below the college level.

Students from thirteen different Mennonite groups were in attendance at the various schools. Several of the smaller and more conservative groups have for the first time, this year, sent a few of their number to one of the schools for a few weeks. Among these groups not previously represented are the Wisler Mennonites, the Kleinegemeinde and the Bruderthaler Mennonites.

Twenty-three Christian groups, other than Mennonites, sent students to the Mennonite schools studied. In addition there was one Hebrew student, and one who merely declared himself a Protestant. Facts concerning church membership were not available for 161 students. As in every previous year since this study has been made the Methodist Episcopal church is the largest non-Mennonite group.

Table VI gives the facts concerning the homes of the 2,274 Mennonite students. As previously, Kansas is the home of the largest number. Saskatchewan has suddenly secured second place due to the more complete returns from the four academies located in that province. 28 states of the United States and 5 Canadian provinces are represented. In addition a few students, mostly children of missionaries, are from India, from Argentine and from Germany.

The accuracy of tables VIII, IX and XI is impaired by the lack of complete returns. The assumptions made in completing the tables are indicated in the appropriate foot notes. Summer session attendance has increased slightly over the previous year at each of the three colleges conducting summer schools. With the increase in attendance noted more graduates are reported. This year's total is the largest since the reports have been compiled. Table XIII summarizes the attendance from several angles for each year since these reports were first compiled (1928-29).

Table I

TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-1936

School	Total Enrlmnt	College	Acdmy	Bible	Other Depts.
Bethel College	402[1]	388	....	....	14[2]
Goshen College	396	346	....	50[3]	....
Eastern Mennonite School	345	40[4]	115	84[3]	106[5]
Bluffton College	246	211	....	....	35[6]
Hesston College & Bible School	232	44	97	80[3]	11[7]
Ontario Bible School	203	....	....	203[9]	....
Tabor College	162	81	66	15[8]	....
Freeman Junior College	129[11]	33	94	....	2
Winkler Bible School	81	8	69	4	....
Bethany Bible School	72	....	72	....	....
German-English Academy	72	....	53	19	....
Corn Bible Academy	69	....	69	....	....
Tabor Bible School	63	....	63	....	....
Oklahoma Bible Academy	60	....	56	4	....
Herbert Bible School	54	....	54	....	....
Frazer Bible School	46	....	46	....	....
Morgenstern Bible School	45	....	45	....	....
Mennonite Collegiate Institute	40	....	40	....	....
Reedley Bible School	35	....	35	....	....
Talitha Bible School	30	....	30	....	....
Zoar Academy and Bible School	24	....	24	....	....
Hillsboro Bible Academy	16	....	16	....	....
Enid Bible School	15	....	15	....	....
Bible Preparatory School	11	....	....	11[10]	....
Total	2848	1151	1059	470	168

1 Bethel College Bulletin, July 15, 1936, p. 80.

2 Five students below college level. The remainder are music students. Bethel College Bulletin, July 15, 1936, pp. 79-88.

3 Bible students for six weeks only.

4 Eastern Mennonite School Bulletin, Vol. XV, No. 4, pp. 92-93.

5 Correspondence students.

6 Fine Arts students not of college rank.

7 Correspondence and extension students.

8 Bible Students not counting duplicates.

9 This school is conducted for twelve weeks each year.

10 A five months course for Bible students.

11 Freeman Junior College Bulletin, June, 1936, pp. 13-14.

Table II

ENROLLMENT BY CLASSES, COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1935-36

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Special	Summer	Other Depts.	Total
Bethel	30	56	89	134	38	41[1]	....	388
Goshen	27	38	83	95	39	56[1]	8[2]	346
Bluffton	34	24	45	75	14	19[1]	....	211
Tabor	....	....	10	56	15	....	....	81
Hesston	....	....	12	32	....	....	....	44[3]
E. M. S.	....	....	15	23	2	....	....	40
Freeman	....	....	9	24	....	....	....	33
Winkler	....	....	....	8	....	....	....	8
Total	91	118	263	447	108	116	8	1151

[1] Not counting duplicates.
[2] Graduate students.
[3] Nineteen of these students are taking the Christian Workers course which is of college grade.

Table III

ENROLLMENT BY CLASSES, STUDENTS NOT OF COLLEGE GRADE, 1935-36

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Unclassified Academy	Bible	Other Depts	Total
E. M. S.	17	16	34	48	....	84	106[2]	305
Ontario	....	....	....	....	....	203	....	203
Hesston	21	18	23	35	....	80	11[3]	188
Freeman	11	19	30	34	....	....	2[7]	96
Tabor	11	13	10	23	....	15[5]	9	81
Winkler	....	20	25	24	....	4	....	73
Rosthern	20	16	7	10	....	19	....	72
Bethany	10	15	14	33	....	....	....	72
Corn	2	2	....	....	65	....	....	69
Dalmeny	....	4	29	30	....	....	....	63
Oklahoma	8	16	21	11	....	4	....	60
Herbert	....	8	11	35	....	....	....	54
Goshen	....	....	....	....	....	50[6]	....	50
Frazer	....	6	20	20	....	....	....	46
Morgenstern	....	....	....	....	45	....	....	45
M. C. I.	....	....	....	....	40	....	....	40
Reedley	....	10	10	15	....	....	....	35
Bluffton	....	....	....	....	....	....	35[4]	35
Talitha	....	....	....	....	30	....	....	30
Zoar	....	....	9	15	....	....	....	24
Hillsboro	....	....	5	11	....	....	....	16
Enid	....	....	....	....	15	....	....	15
Bethel	....	....	....	....	....	....	14[1]	14
Mt. Lake	....	....	....	....	....	11	....	11
Total	100	163	248	344	195	470	177	1697

[1] Five students below college level. Remainder music students. Bethel College Bulletin, July 15, 1936, pp. 79-80.
[2] Correspondence students.
[3] Correspondence and extension students.
[4] Fine Arts students not of college rank.
[5] Bible students not counting duplicates.
[6] Bible students for six weeks only.
[7] Music students.

Table IV

Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1935-36

Denomination	E. M. S.	Goshen	Hesston	Bethel	Ontario	Tabor	Bluffton	Winkler	Bethany	Corn	Rosthern	Dalmeny	Oklahoma	Herbert	Frazer	Morgenst'n	M. C. I.	Reedley	Freeman	Talitha	Zoar	Hillsboro	Enid	Mt. Lake	Total
"Old" Mennonites	334	267	191	1	96	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	893
Mennonites (unclassified)	..	..	..	..	100	..	..	..	72	..	66	63	..	53	46	45[1]	37	..	33[2]	30[1]	..	..	15[1]	11[1]	571
General Conference Mennonites	..	1	22	209	..	13	77	11	..	10	..	..	60	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	6	14	..	..	424
Mennonite Brethren	..	..	2	6	..	117	..	65	..	57	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	31	..	..	2	..	..	..	280
Central Conference Mennonites	..	16	..	..	1	..	20	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	37
Krimmer Mennonite Brethren	..	..	1	..	..	16	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	13	..	..	..	33
Amish Mennonites	6	..	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
Defenseless Mennonites	..	..	2	..	..	1	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
Mennonite Brethren in Christ	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Bruderthaler Mennonites	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	4
Sommerfelder Mennonites	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Holdeman Mennonites	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	2
Kleinegemeinde	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
Wisler (old order) Mennonites	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Total	340	290	219	216	202	149	105	81	72	67	66	63	60	53	46	45	37	34	33	30	24	16	15	11	2274

1 Assumed that all students were Mennonites
2 Assumed that all college students were Mennonites

Table V

NON-MENNONITE STUDENTS IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-36

Denomination	Bluffton	Bethel	Goshen	Freeman	Hesston	Tabor	Rosthern	E. M. S.	M. C. I.	Corn	Reedley	Herbert	Ontario		Total
Statistics not given	....	55	....	96	....	....	6	....	3	....	....	1	....	....	161
Methodist Episcopal	37	37	19	....	5	2	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	101
Presbyterian	22	21	10	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	53
Non-Church Members	26	11	....	3	....	....	2	....	....	....	....	1	....	43
Christian	1	21	7	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	29
Lutheran	11	3	11	....	....	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	27
Evangelical	4	2	7	....	4	5	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	23
Reformed	20	....	3	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	23
Brethren	....	....	22	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	22
United Brethren	10	3	1	....	....	....	....	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	16
Roman Catholic	11	3	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	16
Baptist	2	3	5	....	1	3	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	15
Congregational	6	4	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	13
Episcopalian	4	1	3	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	8
Nazarene	....	5	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	5
Church of Christ	4	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	4
Missionary	3	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	3
Methodist Protestant	1	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2
Church of God	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Congregation Christian	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2
Disciples of Christ	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Friends	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Hebrew	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
New Jerusalem	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Pentecostal	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Plymouth Brethren	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Protestant	....	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Total	141	186	106	96	13	13	6	5	3	2	1	1	1	....	574

STATES, PROVINCES, AND COUNTRIES FROM WHICH MENNONITE STUDENTS COME, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-36

States	E. M. S.	Goshen	Hesston	Bethel	Ontario	Tabor	Bluffton	Winkler	Bethany	Corn	Rosthern	Dalmeny	Oklahoma	Herbert	Frazer	Morgenst'n	M. C. I.	Reedley	Freeman	Talitha	Zoar	Hillsboro	Enid	Mt. Lake	Total
Kansas	..	6	115	179	..	114	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	24	16	..	..	458
Sask.	..	..	..	..	2	2	..	8	72[1]	..	59	63[1]	..	53[1]	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	259
Penna.	200	14	6	..	2	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	230
Ohio	13	72	..	..	16	..	73	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	174
Ontario	6	4	2	..	148	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	166
Oklahoma	..	..	3	11	..	16	..	..	..	63	..	..	55	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	15[2]	..	163
Indiana	1	120	..	..	1	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	130
Manitoba	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	59	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	37	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	97
Virginia	83	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	84
Alberta	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	45[2]	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	58
Montana	..	..	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	46	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	54
Illinois	..	35	4	..	..	..	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	53
S. Dakota	..	..	..	5	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	33	..	..	..	..	..	40
Michigan	3	8	..	..	25	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	37
Calif.	..	..	1	3	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	30	..	..	..	..	..	..	35
British Col.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	30[2]	..	..	..	..	32
Iowa	2	10	16	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	29
Nebraska	..	1	9	10	..	5	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	27
Oregon	..	4	17	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	21
Minn.	..	..	2	3	..	4	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11	21
Maryland	16	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18
New York	7	2	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
Colo.	..	2	10	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14
Idaho	..	..	9	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
N. Dakota	..	..	9	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
Texas	..	..	4	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Missouri	2	3	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
W. Va.	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Miss.	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
India	..	3	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Tennessee	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Argentine	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Germany	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Florida	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Wisconsin	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Washingt'n	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Total	340	290	219	216	202	149	105	81	72	67	66	63	60	53	46	45	37	34	33	30	24	16	15	11	2274

[1] Assumed that all Mennonite students were from Saskatchewan
[2] Assumed that all students were from the province or state where the school is located

Table VII

States, Provinces, and Countries from which Non-Mennonite Students Come, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1935-36

States	Bluffton	Bethel	Goshen	Hesston	Tabor	Rosthern	M. C. I.	E. M. S.	Corn	Reedley	Ontario	Herbert	Freeman	Total
Ohio ..	133	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	135
Kansas	..	100	..	13	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	126
S. Dak.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	96[1]	96
Indiana	..	..	95	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	95
None given		81	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	82
Sask.	..	1	..	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
Penna.	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	6
Illinois	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Okla.	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	4
Manitoba	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Virginia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	3
N. Mex.	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Mich.	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Ontario	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
W. Va.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Calif.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
Wash.	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Md.	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Iowa	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Minn.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
N. J.	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Texas	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Total	141	186	106	13	13	6	3	5	2	1	1	1	96	574

[1] Totals taken from Freeman Junior College Bulletin, June 1936, pp. 13-14.

Table VIII

MENNONITE STUDENTS OF COLLEGE GRADE, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-36

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	103	137	240
Bethel	119	97	216[1]
Bluffton			105[2]
Tabor College	35	42	77
Hesston	21	23	44[3]
E. M. S.	23	17	40
Freeman			33[5]
Winkler	4	4	8
Total	305	320	763[4]

[1] Statistics given in total only.
[2] Bluffton College reports 105 Mennonite Students. For purposes of this table it is assumed that all are college students.
[3] Hesston College and Bible School Bulletin, vol. XXII, No. 3, pp. 27-34.
[4] Bluffton and Freeman statistics do not give details concerning the number of women and the number of men.
[5] Assumed that all college students were Mennonites.

Table IX

MENNONITE STUDENTS NOT OF COLLEGE GRADE, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-36

School	Men	Women	Total
E. M. S.	133	167	300
Ontario	103	99	202
Hesston	....	....	175
Winkler	45	28	73
Bethany	37	35	72
Tabor	27	45	72
Corn	29	38	67
Rosthern	38	28	66
Dalmeny	29	34	63
Oklahoma	27	33	60
Herbert	28	25	53
Goshen	26	24	50
Frazer	20	26	46
Morgenstern	....	....	45
M. C. I.	....	....	37
Reedley	17	17	34
Talitha	....	....	30
Zoar	9	15	24
Hillsboro	7	9	16
Enid	....	....	15
Mt. Lake	8	3	11
	583	626	1511[1]

[1] Detailed statistics not given for several schools hence the grand total is larger than the sum of the separate totals for men and for women.

Table X

SUMMER SESSION, 1935, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	42	48[1]	90
Bethel	31	40	71[2]
Bluffton	21	40	61[3]
Total	94	128	222

[1] One student not of college grade.
[2] Bethel College Bulletin, July 15, 1936, p. 80.
[3] The Bluffton College Bulletin, April, 1936, p. 48.

Table XI

TOTAL ATTENDANCE, MEN AND WOMEN, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1935-36

School	Men	Women	Total
Bethel	213	189	402[1]
Goshen	179	217	396
E. M. S.	160	185	345
Bluffton	132	114	246[2]
Hesston	101	131	232
Ontario	104	99	203
Tabor	69	93	162
Freeman	....	....	129
Winkler	49	32	81
Rosthern	41	31	72
Bethany	37	35	72
Corn	30	39	69
Dalmeny	29	34	63
Oklahoma	27	33	60
Herbert	29	25	54
Frazer	20	26	46
Morgenstern	....	....	45
M. C. I.	....	....	40
Reedley	18	17	35
Talitha	....	....	30
Zoar	9	15	24
Hillsboro	7	9	16
Enid	....	....	15
Mountain Lake	....	....	11
	1254	1324	2848[3]

[1] Bethel College Bulletin, July 15, 1936, p. 80.
[2] The Bluffton College Bulletin, April, 1936, p. 48.
[3] Detailed statistics not given for several schools, hence the grand total is larger than the sum of the separate totals for men and for women.

Table XII

Diplomas Given and Degrees Granted, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, June and August, 1935

	Goshen	Bluffton	Bethel	E. M. S.	Tabor	Freeman	Hesston	Winkler	Oklahoma	Zoar	Hillsboro	Reedley	Ontario	Total
B. A.	19	22	22	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	63
B. S. in Education	12	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	12
B. of School Music	....	5	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	5
B. S.	....	....	3	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	3
Th. B.	1	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1
Junior College	....	....	....	11	7	7	6	....	....	....	....	....	....	31
Two Year Normal	17	....	....	2	....	6	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	25
One Year Normal	....	....	....	....	....	16	....	19	....	....	....	....	....	35
Adv. Bible (College)	....	....	....	3	....	....	2	4	....	....	....	....	....	9
Academy	8	....	....	34	11	11	15	8	7	....	....	....	....	94
Bible Acad. (3 yrs.)	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	1
Bible Acad. (2 yrs.)	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	17	6	2	....	26
Elem. Bible (2 yrs.)	....	....	....	4	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	4
Elem. Bible (1 yr.)	2	....	....	....	....	....	1	....	....	....	....	19	19	41
Stenography	....	....	....	....	2	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	2
Total	59	27	25	54	20	40	24	31	9	17	6	21	19	352

Table XIII

Total Attendance, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1928-1936

Year	Total	Mennonite	College	Academy	Bible	Other Depts.
1928-29	1538	1025	847	569	.....	122
1929-30	1967	1259	1085	609	.....	273
1930-31	2180	1515	1234	710	110	126
1931-32	1928	1337	944	522	259	203
1932-33	1673	1135	906	416	277	74
1933-34	1735	1259	921	348	402	64
1934-35	2272	1742	1025	550	502	195
1935-36	2848	2274	1151	1050	470	177

THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW

Index to Volume X, 1936

JANUARY

Editorial 3

Conrad Grebel, The First Leader of the Swiss Brethren (Anabaptists)
I. Youth and Early University Years
Harold S. Bender 5

The Conversion of Menno Simons: A Quadricentennial Tribute
Cornelius Krahn 46

Menno Simons' Attitude Toward the Anabaptists of Münster
John Horsch 55

Some Religious Pacifists of the Nineteenth Century
Guy F. Hershberger 73

APRIL

Editorial 90

Conrad Grebel, The First Leader of the Swiss Brethren (Anabaptists)
II. Grebel's Study in Paris
Harold S. Bender 91

The Alms Book of the Skippack Mennonite Church 1738-1936
John C. Wenger 138

JULY

Editorial 150

Conrad Grebel, The First Leader of the Swiss Brethren (Anabaptists)
III. The Humanism of Conrad Grebel
Harold S. Bender 151

The Alms Book of the Franconia Mennonite Church, 1767-1936
John C. Wenger 161

Dutch Backgrounds of the Mennonite Migration of the 16th Century to Prussia
Benj. H. Unruh 173

Research Notes 182

OCTOBER

Editorial 186

The Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics, 1682-1756
Guy F. Hershberger 187

Franconia Mennonites and Military Service, 1683-1923
John C. Wenger 222

Attendance at Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1935-1936
Silas Hertzler 246

Mennonite quarterly
review
v.10
1936 CBPaC

v.10
1936 328953

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library
3 2400 00329 8902